

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Period. 439.95

v. 15-16

1911-12



THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

Published by the
Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and other States.

VOLUME XV.



St. Louis :
CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE.
1911.

30.4.17

Period. 439.95-

v. 15-16

1911-12

ANDOVER-HARVARD.
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The Doctrine of Conversion according to Eph. 1, 19. 20 and 2, 1—10...	1
The Rise of Antichrist	16
Miscellany	33
Book Review	41
Walther the Lutheran	65
The Rise of Antichrist	84
The Doctrine of Election according to Eph. 1, 3—14.....	102
The Proof Texts of the Catechism with a Practical Commentary.....	120
Walther the Lutheran	129
Dr. Martin Luther's Treatise of Confession, Whether the Pope Have Power to Enjoin Same	143
The Proof Texts of the Catechism with a Practical Commentary.....	154
Status of the English Work of the German Missouri Synod.....	164
Miscellany	169
Book Review	180
Walther the Lutheran	193
Romanism a Plagiarism on Paganism	204
The Proof Texts of the Catechism with a Practical Commentary.....	220
Luther's Views on Liberty of Conscience	230
Book Review	255

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XV.

JANUARY, 1911.

No. 1.

THE DOCTRINE OF CONVERSION ACCORDING TO

Eph. 1, 19. 20 and 2, 1—10.

(From Stoeckhardt's Commentary.)

Eph. 2, 1—10, together with ch. 1, 19. 20, is a section of Scripture which at all times has passed in the Church for the principal *locus Scripturae classicus* on the doctrine of conversion. Accordingly, we shall summarize the dogmatic yield of our exegetical disquisition in the following main points.

1. Conversion is a change, a transformation of the ethical condition and conduct of man, and this change is not rightly understood except when we bear in mind the ethical character and condition of man prior and up to his conversion, *viz.*, the natural, corrupt state out of which we are removed by conversion. We are by nature spiritually dead. That is the leading thought in Eph. 2: *ὄντας νεκρούς*. We are by nature alienated from the life that is of God; we have become dead unto God and unto everything good. Man was originally created for God and for a life in communion with God. The *Apology* says: "The chief distinction in that noble creature, the first man, was a clear light in his heart whereby he understood God and His work, possessed a genuine fear of God, a very cordial trust in God, and in every respect an upright and firm mind, a fine, noble, and cheerful courage toward God and all divine affairs." (Mueller, p. 81.) This concreated righteousness man has lost by the fall. That is original sin, *viz.*, that man by it "has lost these gifts: true knowledge of God,

true love of God and trust in Him, and the virtue, or light, in his heart which kindled love and desire for all these things in him." This defect, this inability, is spiritual death. In fallen man there is no residue of spiritual affections and emotions, or of spiritual strength. As regards his spiritual condition, he is, in God's view, not merely sick unto death, but actually dead. Spiritual death embraces spiritual blindness. A dead person cannot see. The understanding is darkened, ch. 4, 18. Although natural man is, by means of the works of creation and by means of the Law which has been written in his heart and conscience, capable of attaining to some knowledge of God, of the omnipotence and righteousness of God, and of the will of God, still this natural knowledge is not "a true knowledge of God," not a bright and blessed light in the heart. Man does not know God as his God, as the God and Lord of his life, in whom he is to rejoice, for whom he is to live, and whom he is to serve. God is to him a distant, unapproachable, and forbidding sovereign, with whom he is not in touch inwardly. And while the understanding of the natural man is darkened, his will has been corrupted, and turned from God. The fear of the Lord, love of God, trust in God, are strange and unknown matters to him. And since a neutral attitude is impossible in this business, the will of man, being alienated from God, is at the same time hostile to God. We are by nature children of disobedience; our ethical character has been determined by disobedience. Natural man resists God and the will of God with all the strength of his soul. That is what Paul states Rom. 8, 7: "The carnal mind is enmity against God." This innate evil disposition, this depraved ethical condition, becomes manifest and operative in all sorts of sins and transgressions, in works of the flesh. Although the unconverted person is able, in a manner, to lead an outwardly decent life, still this *justitia civilis* of his is not obedience rendered to God, and possesses no value in God's eyes; for it lacks the true motive. Man, dead in sin, is entirely unable and incapable of thinking, speaking, doing anything right

or good whatsoever; moreover, he is kept firmly attached to his evil disposition and conduct by his environments, by the world round about him, by the course of human affairs, the spirit of the times, and the devil, the prince of this world. The fact that man is by nature spiritually dead, utterly unfit for the affairs of God, and a child of disobedience, becomes apparent especially when God approaches him by means of His Word. When God rebukes man's sin by the word of the Law, and brands even the evil lust of the heart as iniquity, it is then that man's lust becomes very active, the contradiction which man's heart raises against the will of God is intensified, and man resents the demands and the verdict of the divine law. Comp. Rom. 7, 7—11. When God has the Gospel of Christ preached to natural man, he is unable to understand it and to receive it into his heart. For, as the *Form of Concord* puts it, natural man is "like a pillar of salt, like Lot's wife, yea, like a log and stone, like a lifeless statue, which uses neither eyes nor mouth, neither sense nor heart." "All teaching and preaching are lost upon him, until he is enlightened, converted, and regenerated by the Holy Ghost. (Jacobs, p. 556.) In like manner Paul testifies elsewhere: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them," 1 Cor. 2, 14. Yea, everything in him rebels against Christ, against faith. That, as we have seen, is what is expressed in ch. 1, 19. 20. Christ crucified is "unto the Jews a stumbling-block and unto the Greeks foolishness," 1 Cor. 1, 23. When God offers to man in the Gospel grace and salvation, man is not only unable to believe or give his assent to the offer, but he resists it willfully and in a hostile spirit, unless he is enlightened and governed by the Spirit of God, as our confession states in the place aforecited. And this inability, this disobedience, this hostile resistance, continues until man is enlightened, converted, and regenerated by the Holy Ghost. This is a miserable, unhappy state. Since we are by nature spiritually dead and children of disobedience, we are all by

nature children of wrath. Nor is there found in natural man the least longing and desire for deliverance from this misery. A dead person does not move; not the faintest wish to become alive stirs in him.

2. Conversion is the transformation of the natural ethical condition of man. And now it is of importance, as we enter upon a consideration of this change, that we note the manner in which the apostle describes this transformation in our Epistle and elsewhere. He does not describe it *in abstracto*, by laying down a general rule by which sinners can be converted, but he gives quite a concrete description; for he talks about the very persons who are, or have been, actually converted; he reminds the Christians of those things which by the grace of God they had experienced in their hearts. Thus he writes ch. 1, 19: "And what is the exceeding greatness of His power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of His mighty power." Eph. 2: "And you"—"and us, even when we were dead . . . God hath quickened." In a similar manner he says in 2 Thess. 2, 14: "Whereunto He called you by our Gospel." 1 Cor. 1, 9: "God is faithful, by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of His Son Jesus Christ, our Lord." Rom. 9, 24: "Even us, whom He hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles." This *forma docendi* arrests our thought at the start and rivets it upon the wonderful, yet actual, concrete event and occurrence which is treated at this place; it leads Christians rightly to understand and ponder those things which have happened to them, and it checks idle and misleading speculations which are ill suited to this mystery of godliness. If the discussion of this matter deals *in genere* with conversion and nonconversion, and those persons, too, who have not been converted, together with what God has done for them, are embraced in some general rule, our perception becomes clouded, and we are forced to insert all sorts of conclusions as connecting links, and our meditation soon becomes lost in a bewildering chaos of obscure and ambiguous concepts, in a maze of truth and fiction. The apostle aims his instruction regarding con-

version—just as he did that regarding election—not primarily at those who are without, for the purpose of winning them, of converting sinners, but his aim is to advance believing Christians in their knowledge, and thus to establish them in their Christianity. When seeking to convert sinners to God, to Christ, we tell them, first of all, that they are sinners, but that sinners have a Savior; we preach to them Christ and the redemption which is by Christ Jesus. By such preaching faith is kindled in the hearts, and upon those who believe we then impress the truth, that it is only by the grace of God that they are what they are, and hence they must expect and ask in prayer only from the grace of the Lord all that they are still lacking.

3. Conversion is an internal change, transformation of man. Not, indeed, a change of man's substance, of the substance of his mind, his intellect and will. Man has after his conversion the same rational soul, the same intellect and will as before. But conversion is a thorough change of the moral condition and habitude of man, a change in his intellect, will, heart. Man's intellect and will receive a different direction, and are differently determined by conversion, from what they were before: while prior to conversion they were turned away from God and directed against Him, they are now turned toward God and divine matters. This change Paul characterizes by such terms as raising out of death, quickening, recreation, and by stating that the old corrupt state, which he termed disobedience, has now ceased. Spiritual death is spiritual inability, utter unfitness as regards the affairs of God, and complete absence of all spiritual affections and emotions. Accordingly, conversion, or quickening from spiritual death, consists in the removal of spiritual unfitness and the bestowal of spiritual fitness, also in the originating of new spiritual emotions in man, *motus et actus mentis et voluntatis spirituales, boni, salutares*. The *Form of Concord* throughout the Second Article describes conversion as the bestowal of new spiritual strength and new spiritual emotions. The new spiritual life

which begins in conversion is made up of movements and acts of the intellect and will. However, "strength" and "movements" (emotions) must not be separated. The new spiritual ability becomes action forthwith. Positing *vires* or *facultates novae spirituales*, the *motus et actus mentis et voluntatis* are *eo ipso* posited. Just this is what our Confession expresses by the definition of conversion which it offers, *viz.*, that a darkened understanding becomes an enlightened understanding, and a refractory will an obedient will. The critical point in this business lies in the will, and in the obedience of the will. Disobedience is changed into obedience, a child of disobedience becomes a child of obedience. The first *motus et actus spiritualis* is faith in Christ. Being converted and becoming a believer coincide. The apostle states emphatically that we are raised, quickened, created in Christ Jesus by faith. Briefly, this is the wonderful change through which we passed when we became Christians: we heard, and we believed, we accepted by faith, the Word of truth, the Gospel of our salvation, ch. 1, 13. While walking in our own ways, departing from God, running counter to God's direction, we heard the Gospel of Christ; and after hearing it for a longer or shorter time, suddenly the veil was taken from our heart; we recognized Jesus as our Savior and Redeemer, we beheld in His face the glory of God. The crucified Christ, who first seemed foolishness to us, now appeared to us divine wisdom. And in Christ we knew God as the Father of all mercy, as our God and Father. By that same act, however, our heart and will were won for Christ and God. Our hostile resistance was broken. The crucified Christ, who was an offense to us at first, now became the solace and joy of our heart. We reposed our trust, the confidence of our heart, in this Jesus, the only Helper and Savior. And with the kindling of faith other godly virtues, such as the fear of the Lord, love of God, obedience to God and God's will, were kindled in our heart, and we promptly manifested our obedience by good works, by willing compliance with the Law of God. Conversion is instantaneous.

Death as well as the raising from death occur in a twinkling. A gradual passage from death into life, a successive conversion is a nonentity, a *contradictio in adjecto*. The first spark of faith,—with which, indeed, other spiritual *motus mentis et voluntatis* are soon associated,—the first spark of faith, no matter how feeble, a faint longing at first for the salvation of Christ,—that is, strictly speaking, conversion. Although we may not be able definitely to state the hour and the moment when the first spark of faith was kindled in us, still that moment was the decisive moment, the awaking from spiritual sleep and death, the passage from death into life, from the state of wrath into the state of grace. Prior to this moment, up to this moment, we were still dead, utterly dead in sins, enemies of God, and disobedient. Up to that moment not the least change had occurred in our ethical condition. The new spiritual movements which began in conversion were quite strange and unknown to us before. Conversion is a re-creation. Of those things which are created in conversion, nothing, absolutely nothing, existed before. Up to the hour of our conversion there were in our soul only foolish, ungodly, wicked thoughts and movements of the will, and such as were opposed to God; there was not a single nobler emotion, nor was there any nobler emotion excited by grace. For such nobler emotion would have been conversion. As soon as a dead person begins to move faintly, he is alive. There is, verily, no contrast more glaring than that between death and life. And there is nothing to mediate the transfer from death into life. In the moment when we were raised out of spiritual death, when the *prima initia fidei* began to stir in us, we had all of a sudden become new men, new creatures; we had been transferred into an altogether different world; we had gained access to God and heaven, and we lived once more for that end for which we were created, namely, unto the God of our life. On the other hand, we must, indeed, firmly hold that conversion is but the beginning of the new spiritual life, the beginning of a moral renewal, which is continued throughout the life of

a Christian and consummated in the life everlasting. Our Epistle is evidence what great importance the apostle attaches to the growth of the inner man, the growth of knowledge, faith, and sanctification in us. In our conversion the intellect, heart, and will have become renewed; however, there is still much remaining within us of the old, evil, foolish, ungodly, refractory traits. The characteristic of a converted person is not perfect holiness and spiritual-mindedness, — that cannot be attained in this life, — but the opposition and conflict between the new man and the old. Comp. ch. 4, 22—24. Meanwhile the real *ego* of a Christian, of a converted person, that which governs his mind, life, and conversation, and by the power and grace of God maintains its ground in opposition to the sins still clinging to the Christian, is the *ego* which has been renewed in conversion. Paul testifies concerning himself, Rom. 7, 25, that notwithstanding the fact that with the flesh he still serves the law of sin, he serves God with his real *ego*, *αὐτὸς ἐγώ*.

4. And now the apostle emphasizes in the strongest manner possible that God has done all this, — that He has wrought in us. God has suddenly interfered with the course of our life and has given it another direction, leading us in the opposite direction. Conversion is *in solidum* the work of God. To raise the dead is a divine work and prerogative. While we were still dead in sins, God has quickened us and placed us together with Christ in a new spiritual, heavenly life and conversation. God has removed our spiritual incapacity, has endowed us with new spiritual strength, has elicited the new spiritual emotions in our intellect, heart, and will. To create anew, to call into being that which is not, is a divine work and prerogative. It is God, too, who has produced the new creature. We are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus. God has taken away our disobedience and resistance, and has made the unwilling willing. We believe according to the working of the might, power, and strength of God. By His great power and strength God has wrought in us faith in Christ, by

which we are born again, and has overcome everything in us that resisted Christ and faith in Him. The Word of truth, the Gospel of our salvation, by which we attained to faith, is a means in God's hand. God has with His strong hand pressed the Gospel of Christ, His Son, the sinners' Savior, into our heart, has written it into our inner being, has opened our inner eye and ear unto its teaching, and thus has kindled faith and, together with faith, other godly virtues in us. God has even before ordained and placed in readiness for us the good works in which we are walking now. Accordingly, all glory and honor for the work of our conversion, renewal, salvation, belongs to God alone. However, it is purely His great love, mercy, and grace that has prompted Him to quicken and save us. It is proper, on the basis of ch. 2, 5. 8, that the Church speaks of a *gratia convertens* or *operans*. Our conversion, vivification, is a gracious operation of God. This is followed by another, *viz.*, God strengthens and preserves us in faith and obedience. This is *gratia cooperans* or *conservans*. Comp. 1 Pet. 5, 10. But as to a *gratia praeveniens* or *prae-parans*, which is said to precede and to prepare the way for salvation, all that has been said about this kind of grace utterly contradicts the presentation which the apostle has made. Conversion, or vivification, is, by the native force of these terms and by reason of its nature, *prima gratia*, the first gracious operation of God in our heart. For until he is converted man is dead in sins, and a dead person is absolutely not susceptible of any operation whatsoever. Not until He has wrought this great miracle in man and quickened him out of death, God can continue to work in him.

5. By the absolute and very emphatic declaration of the apostle, that God has quickened us according to His might and grace, that He has created us anew, that He has mastered our resistance, and has wrought faith and obedience in us, all and every cooperation of man for his own conversion is excluded. This fact is, indeed, posited by the very concept "dead;" for a dead person cannot raise himself nor contribute anything

toward his own vivification. However, to ward off every error, the apostle adds to his presentation of this matter the *particulars exclusivas*: οὐκ ἐξ ἑμαῶν, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων. The great ethical change which has here been described has not sprung from out of our own will and resolve, nor has it been occasioned or anticipated by any act or conduct on our part whatsoever. In the strongest manner possible our Confession emphasizes the fact that man cannot effect anything, nor can he in any way cooperate, toward his conversion, nor can he dispose or prepare himself for it, not even in the least degree. Every form of synergism, the fine as well as the gross, stands condemned by the apostle's testimony, which is clear as the day. Modern theologians of a "churchly" character—we ignore the "liberal" theologians, who are plainly Pelagianists—usually represent the process of conversion thus: It is, indeed, God who makes the beginning in this business, by conveying new strength by His Word to sinful and corrupt man, and by restoring in all who hear the Word their lost freedom of will or freedom of choice, and then men, by the strength of their *arbitrium liberatum*, decide in favor of Christ and of the salvation that is in Christ, some, it is true, deciding adversely. This is, in a new form, the old teaching of Latermann, who held that man cooperates in his conversion by means of a strength which has been given him. The only difference is this, that modern theologians have changed Latermann's *co-operatio* into an *operatio*, that they trace conversion itself, faith itself, to the self-acting conduct of man, and that they have coined the password "self-decision," albeit they claim that such self-decision is not possible except by grace. This theory is diametrically opposed to the entire presentation which the apostle has made of this matter. The concept "dead in sins" is rendered valueless and emptied of its content when an *arbitrium liberatum* prior to conversion, hence, eventually, the choosing of what is good, is ascribed to man who is dead in sins, hence, dead unto all that is good. The glory of God, expressed in such statements as these: "God hath quickened

us," "created in Christ Jesus," "by grace are ye saved," becomes vitiated when the work and operation of God is restricted to His rendering it possible for man to convert himself. The bold contrast, in no way mediated, between death and life—*καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασι συνεζωποίησε*—is wiped out by the assumption that man, while still dead spiritually, is engaged in a decisive conflict, in which he gradually forges ahead unto the life in God; it is effaced by interposing between death and life a *status medius, tertius*, in which man trains himself to the use of the new strength of life granted him. Every clear conception and notion of death and life, quickening from death, creating, is wrecked upon the rock of this new-fangled wisdom. Moreover, that state of ethical neutrality which must be assumed when we assume freedom of choice, is logically and ethically a non-entity of which Scripture knows nothing. The apostle's statement that God works faith can nevermore bear this interpretation, that God effects merely the *facultas credendi*, and that man is to actualize this faculty. On the contrary, according to all the rules of language and logic the meaning can only be this, that God works the very faith of man, that together with the *facultas* He effects the *actus credendi*. Moreover, this entire theory is, in a very direct manner, shut out utterly by the apostle's statement: *οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν*, "not of yourselves," not even in the least part of yourselves. It is but a finer form of synergism which is expressed in the doctrine of the later Lutheran dogmaticians concerning conversion, and which is maintained and championed by a goodly part of the "confessional" theologians of our day. True, over and against Latermann those theologians insisted that God alone, without any cooperation of man, effects conversion in the strict sense, or faith, and by faith they meant the very act of believing; but in their view conversion is preceded by a longer or shorter process, in which man is rendered capable of, and prepared for, conversion by God. They teach that prevenient grace, so-called, produces in all men who bear the Word certain new

motus, which they have even termed *motus spirituales, bonos, sanctos, pios*; that prevenient grace removes man's natural incapacity, and thus enables man to refrain from what has been called malicious resistance, and that man is converted by God when he makes the proper use of this *facultas non resistendi*. By this form of teaching likewise the apostle's statements concerning death, quickening, and the immediate transfer from death to life are rendered illusory; for by this teaching there is ascribed to man, while still dead spiritually and unconverted, the ability to assume a proper attitude to grace, yea, the attitude itself is ascribed, namely, the refraining from malicious resistance; and a person's conversion is made to depend on his conduct. And the apostolic dictum: οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν, not in consequence of a particular conduct on our part, is canceled when conversion is represented as taking place in consequence of the previous conduct of man, even though it be asserted that such conduct must be rendered possible by grace. Add to this that not a word is said in the Biblical text before us regarding all these synergistic matters and occurrences, which have been inserted between death and quickening. Verily, the complicated speculations aforementioned have not grown out of a study of Scripture, but they have been invented in defiance of Scripture by man, who would like to assert his own knowledge and activity somewhat in this matter. These speculations have their genesis in the desire, more or less consciously cherished, to find a reasonable explanation for the inscrutable mystery why some are converted, others not, and to secure for man a certain share in his own conversion and salvation. We abide by the simple statements of Scripture, gladly sacrificing our own wisdom and our own glory; yea, acknowledging our own incapacity, we render thanks to God, because He alone, without us, without any cooperation or preparation on our part, has translated us out of death into life by His power and grace.

6. It is sheer folly when the charge is raised against the Lutheran, Scriptural teaching of the sole operation of God in

man's conversion, that this teaching makes conversion a compulsory conversion, a mechanical process, and endangers the ethical character of this act. By no means; conversion as represented in Scripture, also by Paul in his Epistle to the Ephesians, is not an act of violence inflicted on man, and repulsive to every faculty which man possesses, but, in the language of our Confession, it is a change, a new movement and emotion in the intellect, will, and heart; it affects, in particular, the will of man; and the will of man does not suffer itself to be coerced. God does not compel man to obey Him against his will, but He seizes man's will and makes children of disobedience, unwilling persons, willing. In conversion God renews the will of man and liberates the will which has been held captive by sin and the devil; not so as to establish an *aequilibrium*, an equipoise of good and evil, for that would be void of ethical quality, but in such a manner that the will becomes free, and actually is free in God, and that man willingly and gladly lives unto God and serves Him. God works faith, and faith is pure willingness, it is *velle et accipere*, willing apprehension and acceptance of the salvation which is in Christ. Moreover, the means of conversion excludes pressure and coercion. God converts man, effects faith in him, by the preaching of the Word, of the Gospel, and this preaching is addressed to the intellect, heart, and will of man. When the Holy Ghost, by means of the Gospel, excites new emotions in the mind of man; when sinful man, while meditating the Gospel, the incomparable love of God which caused Christ to die for the ungodly, for His enemies, is stirred and seized by the Spirit of God and begins to breathe freely and to feel a new life throbbing in him; when he ceases his resistance and flies into the arms of his Redeemer,—that is the most thoroughgoing change and emotion imaginable, the very opposite of a conversion by force, or a mechanical change. A conversion by force results much rather from the synergistic view, which assumes that God restores in all men who hear

the Word, also in those who are still unwilling, the freedom of choice or a *facultas non resistendi*.

7. In his description of conversion and of the beginning of faith the apostle mentions only the Gospel, ch. 1, 13, and does not say a word about the Law. True, he declares elsewhere, for instance, by his arrangement of the contents of the Epistle to the Romans, that the Law must precede the Gospel. The knowledge of Christ presupposes the knowledge of sin. The comfort of the Gospel and faith finds no abode except in a heart and conscience crushed by the Law. However, Paul defines, in this very Epistle, Rom. 7, 7—11, the effect of the Law, by stating that the Law reveals, rouses, increases, intensifies sin, and makes the sinner a slave of death. Luther, commenting on Gal. 3, 19, remarks: "When a person has sin, death, the wrath and judgment of God revealed to him by the Law, he cannot but lose his patience, rebel against God, and hate Him and His will." The Law does not effect the least change in the natural, sinful condition of man. The Law produces only mortifying effects. And hence, the Law has no part in the spiritual vivification; nothing but confusion is created by inserting the effects of the Law as an intermediate element between spiritual death and the quickening from death.

8. There is an eternal background to our conversion, vivification, salvation. In Eph. 2 the apostle speaks of and to the same persons as in Eph. 1; he speaks of such as are now become Christians, of those persons whom God, according to ch. 1, 3—14, has chosen before the foundation of the world in Christ, unto the adoption of children and also unto the inheritance of children, *i. e.*, unto salvation. According to ch. 1, 3—14, the preaching of the Gospel and the originating of faith in us are parts of the realization of God's eternal decree of election. (Comp. my Excursus on the Doctrine of Election, sub 9.) And according to ch. 2, 7, those whom God, according to His great love, mercy, and grace, has quickened spiritually, are identical with those on whom God in ages to come will bestow the abundant riches of His grace,

hence, with those who are ultimately saved. Thus Paul declares Rom. 8, 30: *ὁὗς δὲ προώρισεν, τοὺτους καὶ ἐκδήλεσεν*. And this is that "excellent, glorious consolation," of which our Confession speaks: "that God was so solicitous concerning the conversion, righteousness, and salvation of every Christian, and so faithfully provided therefor, that before the foundation of the world was laid He deliberated concerning it, and in His purpose ordained how He would bring me thereto and preserve me therein." (Jacobs, p. 657.) Yea, it is a comfort to me to know that God was so solicitous concerning my conversion and salvation that He graciously ordained even in eternity the hour of my conversion and the hour of my death which is to land me at the final, blessed goal of my vocation.

9. When conversion is being discussed, it is customary to advert also to those who are not converted and saved. However, the reason for the status of these people, *viz.*, that unbelief and damnation have their cause only in man,—this fact is recorded on another page in our Bible, and does not belong in this discussion. If this matter is drawn into the description of conversion, it only darkens the perception of the great work of grace which God has performed in us. In Eph. 1 and 2 Paul, as we remarked above, speaks of such persons only as are actually being converted, or have been converted, of those whom God has chosen in eternity, and has called in time, converted, and to whom He has finally given eternal salvation. When pondering this matter, it is likely that also in this connection the question will be suggested to us: *Cur alii prae aliis*, why are some converted, others not? But this question pertains to the inscrutable secrets of God which we cannot and may not find out, which God has reserved unto His own wisdom. A person who seeks to find out and explain what is inscrutable will forfeit the light of revealed truth. Comp. my *Excursus on Election*.)

THE RISE OF ANTICHRIST.

Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento,
Hæc tibi erunt artes. — *Aeneis*, VI, 852. 853.

II.

When, in 813, Charles the Great felt his death approaching, he took with his own hands the crown from the high altar of the minster at Aachen and placed it on the head of his son Louis, thereby asserting that he and his posterity derived their title neither from the Pope, nor from the Romans, but directly from the will of God Himself. But when, in 816, Pope Stephen IV went to France, Louis did not wait for the Pope's submission, but thrice prostrated himself at Stephen's feet before venturing to embrace him. The next Sunday the Pope placed the crown on Louis, and thus the Emperor gave up the independence which Charles the Great had so anxiously secured for him. Stephen IV held the papal power the living power of the Apostle Peter, nay, of God Himself, giving the Pope jurisdiction over all and exemption from all human judgments. (Hauck, *Der Gedanke*, 9.) In maintaining the superiority of the papal power over the imperial power, Stephen IV took the first step on the road to the Pope's world rule.

Until now it had been the custom of Popes to begin their letters to princes by putting first the name of the prince, calling him Lord, and putting their own names afterwards; now Leo IV (847—855) put his own name first, and omitted the title Lord. He also began to use in his documents the papal reckoning of years beside the imperial reckoning. He fortified the mouth of the Tiber and walled the quarter around St. Peter's, called after him the "Leonine City." Benedict III held that the Pope confirms the Emperor and the Emperor supports the Pope.

As the worldly power of the Popes increased, Christianity decreased. Fighting bishops now appear: one day they would wear the miter and conduct cathedral services, the next they would wear the helmet and wield the lance and sword on the bloody field of battle.

Under the warrant of the forged "Donation of Constan-

tine," the custom of crowning the Pope at his enthronement in Peter's chair began with Nicholas I, 858—867, the Emperor acting as equerry, holding the stirrup for the Pope.

Pope Alexander III († 1181), was the first to place a crown round the ordinary papal miter; Boniface VIII (1294—1303) added a second crown; Urban V, about 1370, added the third crown which adorns the tiara, to signify the Pope's power over heaven, earth, and hell.

When Emperor Louis II was visited by Pope Nicholas I, he held the Pope's bridle and walked at the side of the riding Pope, after the example of Constantine the Great—according to the forged "Donation."

Nicholas I asserted that, with or without appeal to him, the Bishop of Rome had an inherent right to take notice of all cases affecting bishops, even to the exclusion of the Provincial Synods, in whose courts, according to the canons and customs of the whole Church, the cases of bishops had, as a matter of right and custom, been finally tried. (*Angl. Br.*, 51.)

Hincmar of Rheims was compelled to concede the principle of an appeal from the Frankish Church to Rome, according to the canon of Sardica, contrary to the law of France, for Charles the Great had expressly cut that out of the code of France; it was inserted in the Frankish code by the forger Benedict, the Levite of Mainz. In the trouble with Bishop Rothad of Soissons, Pope Nicholas I claimed rights which went far beyond the Sardican canon, and he maintained the genuineness and binding force of the Sardican canons.

In his fight with Photius of Constantinople, Nicholas declared to the Greeks that the Roman Church is the head of all churches, and that on it all churches depend. From this quarrel dates the separation between the churches of the East and the West.

Regino, Abbot of Pruem, writes of Nicholas I: "He gave his commands to kings and tyrants and ruled over them with authority as if he were lord of the world." (Robertson, *Growth*, 170.)

The bishops of Cologne and Treves complained that the Pope "set himself up as the lord of all the earth."

Emperor Charles the Bald wrote to him: "We are ever ready to obey the commands of your Holiness." (Krueger, 61.)

Nicholas I said the Pope is "spiritually omnipresent and omniscient;" he might have justly added, "omnipotent." Disobedience to the Pope is idolatry; opposition to him is blasphemy. Peter himself lives in the Popes and acts through them. The Pope is to be obeyed even when he is in the wrong, even if he acts so here and otherwise elsewhere, for he owes no one an explanation and justification. "Ita volumus et ita decernimus." From the Pope's spiritual duty grows a political right, to decide who can be king, the right to revolt. The Emperor has his office from the Pope. Peter used the secular sword to punish Malchus, the spiritual sword to punish Ananias and Sapphira. Peter lives and acts in the Popes. (Hauck, *Der Gedanke*, 13—22.)

In 876 Pope John VIII really nominated Charles the Bald as Emperor in succession to Charles the Great, and also Carloman, and Charles the Fat. In return for this service, Charles the Bald surrendered for himself and his successors all rights of interfering in the election of the Popes.

In the newly converted kingdoms of Hungary and Poland the papal pretensions were introduced as a part of Christianity, and from these countries the Pope drew tribute.

Pope John XV, in the contest for the archbishopric of Rheims, established the principle of exclusive jurisdiction over all bishops, which had been asserted for the papacy by the forged decretals.

In the first three centuries it is impossible to find an invocation of a saint. Pope John XV, 985—996, was the first to canonize one—Ulrich of Augsburg. The "Hail Mary!" dates from about 1000, and the "Holy Mary, pray for us!" was added after 1520.

Pope Gregory V, 996—999, compelled Robert I of France to separate from Queen Bertha on the ground that they were

related in the fourth degree, and that he had contracted a spiritual affinity by being sponsor for one of her children by a former marriage.

Otto I, the Great, 936—973, labored to convert the heathen on his borders. Otto III enriched the Church by large grants and privileges.

Henry II, 1002—1024, was a devout and ascetic champion of the papacy.

In 1022, the Council of Seligenstadt complained that Rome had extended her rule even over the laity. (Flick, 590.)

After the middle of the eleventh century "Curia," or court, came into use, in spite of the opposition of many clergy of the old school who thought it a degradation to apply such a worldly expression to the Holy Roman Church.

Under Leo IX, 1049—1055, a new era of papal power began. On July 16, 1054, the papal envoys laid the papal sentence of excommunication of the Patriarch Michael Caerularius on the altar of St. Sophia at Constantinople, where it has been in force up to the present day.

At this time the Cardinal Bishop Humbert, in his "Against the Simonists," says the priestly order is like the eyes in the human body, while the laity resemble the breast and arms and must obey and defend the Church. Peter Damiani for the first time uses the idea of the two swords, the king using the sword of the world and the priest the sword of the Word.

Pope Victor II, 1055—1057, continued the aggressive reform policy of Cluny under Hildebrand's guidance; so did Stephen IX, 1057—1058. Pope Benedict X was imprisoned by Hildebrand and Nicholas II elected, who was under the influence of Hildebrand.

Under Nicholas II, in 1059, the Lateran Council enacted that the Pope's election should first be treated by the cardinal-bishops, *i. e.*, the bishops of the seven dioceses which formed the Pope's immediate province, Ostia, Porto, St. Rufina, Albano, Sabina, Tusculum, and Palestrina; that they should then call

in the lower cardinals, and that afterwards the rest of the clergy and the people should be asked to assent to the choice.

Thus the influence of the Emperor was reduced to practically nothing. This was the greatest revolution ever attempted in the hierarchy.

In the same year Nicholas II made a treaty with the Norman Robert Guiscard, giving him Apulia, Calabria, and such other Italian territory as he might take from the Greeks and Saracens, while Robert swore to take his land as a fief of the Roman Pope and pay a yearly quit-rent. This lasted until the first French Revolution. — Ranke writes: "In the defection of the Normans from the German Empire it sustained one of its greatest losses, and through the alliance with them the Pope became Emperor of Southern Italy."

Nicholas II declared that papal bulls had the same force as acts of councils — the first expression of that kind.

Under Pope Nicholas II Berengar was forced at the Lateran Synod, in April, 1059, to confess the Capernaïtic heresy that Christ's body is sensibly touched by the hands of the priest and broken by the teeth of the communicant.

Alexander II was the first Pope elected by the College of Cardinals, and the Empress, feeling that the royal prerogatives had been encroached upon, had Pope Honorius II elected; but Alexander II was at last recognized. "Hildebrand found the Church a handmaid and left her free."

Alexander II, 1061—1073, gave William of Normandy the right to assume the crown of England, exacting a yearly tribute. Godfrey of Lorraine took his duchy in fee from Pope Alexander II.

Du Fresne proves that in the fifth century all bishops were called *Papa*, as to-day the local clergy are called *Papa* in the Prussian Middle Mark and along the river Havel. (Schick, 114.)

Papa is short for *pater patrum*, father of fathers, and was a title of respect for all clergy, as it is in the Greek Church to this day. Later it was restricted to bishops. In the fourth

century it was reserved for metropolitans and patriarchs. After the fifth century it was claimed by the Pope. In 1073 Gregory VII formally forbade its use by others; he also assumed the title of "Bishop of bishops."

While under the weak Henry IV the German empire was torn by tumults, the papal chair was filled by the astute Gregory VII, in 1073. The Catholic Du Pin says: "No sooner was this man made Pope, but he formed a design of becoming lord, spiritual and temporal, over the whole earth; the supreme judge and determiner of all affairs, both ecclesiastical and civil; . . . the disposer not only of . . . ecclesiastical benefices, but also of kingdoms, states, and the revenues of particular persons." (Wylie, 73.)

"What belongs to the Pope" was laid down in 1087 by Cardinal Deusdedit in 27 short sentences and included in the state papers of Gregory VII and known as "Dictatus Gregorii Papae." Here are a few:—

9. That all princes should kiss the feet of the Pope alone.
12. That he can depose emperors.
17. That no book can be held to be canonical without his command.
19. That he can be judged by no one.
22. That the Roman Church has never erred, and will never err in all the future.
27. That he is able to absolve subjects from their oath of fealty to wicked rulers.

According to Gregory VII, the Pope is the only ruler in the world; as all bishops are his servants, so also all rulers, even the emperor.

Gregory VII said: "The Church cannot be freed from servitude to the laity unless the clergy are freed from their wives." (Bain, *Devel.*, 122.)

The first thing done by Gregory to strengthen the papacy, to detach the clergy from the world, and attach them to the Pope, was to call a council, in 1074, and pronounce the marriage of priests unlawful, and he sent his legates through

Europe to compel bishops and all others to put away their wives.

At a synod at Erfurt, called by the Archbishop of Mainz, there were tumultuous protests against the Pope, who tried "to make wives prostitutes and children bastards." The Archbishop nearly lost his life. The Archbishop of Rouen was stoned and compelled to flee; an abbot was beaten, spit upon, and dragged to prison; so everywhere.

In 1075 Gregory forbade secular rulers to confer bishoprics, and he excommunicated the Emperor's councilors. He accused the Emperor of crimes in his private life and threatened to excommunicate him. At Worms Cardinal Hugo Candidus heaped the most serious charges on Gregory, even laying at his door the death of his predecessor. In reply the Pope deposed the Emperor.

When Henry IV was excommunicated, he crossed the Alps to Canossa and with bare head and with bare feet stood outside for three days begging for pardon while Pope Gregory VII was inside with the beautiful Countess Matilda of Tuscany. On the fourth day the Emperor was admitted and forgiven by the Pope.

Pope Gregory VII himself writes to the German princes that Emperor Henry IV came to Canossa. "And there, having laid aside all the belongings of royalty, wretchedly, with bare feet and clad in wool, he continued for three days to stand before the gate of the castle. Nor did he desist from imploring with many tears the aid and consolation of the apostolic mercy until he had moved all of those who were present there, and whom the report reached, to such pity and depth of compassion that, interceding for him with many prayers and tears, all wondered indeed at the unaccustomed hardness of our heart, while some actually cried out that we were exercising, not the gravity of apostolic severity, but the cruelty, as it were, of a tyrannical ferocity. Finally, conquered by the persistency of his compunction and by the constant supplications of all those who were present, we loosed the chain of anathema and at

length received him into the favor of communion and into the lap of the holy mother church." (*Ideas that have Infl. Civilization*, vol. 41, p. 333.)

The Countess Matilda was the richest heiress of the age and an enthusiastic admirer of Gregory VII; while he was her guest at the Apennine fortress of Canossa, in 1077, she executed a deed of all her territories to the Pope after her death; and this "Donation of Matilda" was afterward renewed, in 1115. This added to the papal power and wealth.

Pope Sylvester II, in 999, blew the first trumpet to free Jerusalem from the Mohammedans; Gregory VII, in 1074, also urged "all Christians" to drive out the Turks; Victor III, in 1087, offered forgiveness of sins to all taking part in the good work; Urban II in his great speech at Clermont, in November, 1095, made the multitude shout, "God wills it!" and the first of about eight crusades was begun.

The crusades gave to the Popes a vast increase of power and influence. Urban II placed himself at the head of this great movement and left it as a legacy to his successors. The Pope was commander-in-chief of the armies of the faith. The crusader was the soldier of the Church, and this allegiance released him from all other, and from all civil and social obligations. The Pope became liege lord of Christendom, invested with a kind of supremacy new and unprecedented, and furnished with a fresh and rich source of revenue, for it was the custom of the crusader, on starting, to entrust his estate to the Church: if he died, the Church kept it; if he returned, he allowed the Church to keep it, and he entered a cloister. For two centuries this went on, the Church ever receiving, rarely returning.

The crusades furnished the Popes with a welcome pretext for sending legates into every country for exacting permanent tribute from monks and clergy, and for inquiring into all church incomes in order to settle the proportion of the tribute for the Holy War. Much of this money found its way to other uses. Bishops "in partibus infidelium" were appointed in the

East; also the Latin patriarchates of Jerusalem and Antioch were established. The sale of indulgences became a regular traffic, and the traffic in relics became enormous.

The great military orders of the Knights Templar, St. John Hospitaler, and Teutonic Knights placed themselves under the authority of the Pope and increased his glory with their wealth and power.

Besides many others, the Dominicans, Franciscans, and Augustinians were directly responsible to the Pope alone and used by him to raise money; preach crusades; sell indulgences; execute excommunications; serve as spies, and secret police, and papal legates, and missionaries, and political plotters.

Pope Paschal II († 1118) said: "It is a most execrable thing that those hands which have received power above that of angels, which can by an act of their ministry create God Himself, and offer Him for the salvation of the world, should ever be put into subjection of the hand of kings." (Wylie, 410.)

After the smaller synods in the Lateran, in 649 and 1112, Calixtus II held the first Lateran Council in 1123, where he confirmed the Concordat of Worms of 1122, according to which the Pope was to invest the bishops with the ring and staff, the Emperor with the scepter, whereby the clergy were emancipated from the secular rulers and subjected wholly to the Pope. It was ended in 1806, at the dissolution of the empire.

He was the first to publish the decrees in his own name. Three successive Lateran Councils,—held 1139, under Innocent II; 1179, under Alexander III; 1215, under Innocent III,—were little more than mediums for publishing papal decrees. The same may be said of the two Councils of Lyons, in 1245, under Innocent IV, and in 1274, under Gregory X, and the Council at Vienne, in 1311—1312, under Clement V, who suppressed the Knights Templar "by the mere plenitude of his power." (*Angl. Br.*, 57.)

The Second Lateran Council, in 1139, in the 8th canon, forbade Christians to hear mass of married clergy. Priests had to do penance for marrying; the marriage was held invalid.

Spain was reclaimed from Islamism, Prussia was rescued from paganism, and both submitted to the rule of Rome.

In the quarrel between Anselm of Canterbury and William Rufus and Henry I, all appealed to Rome time and again, and thus Rome's influence grew apace. Under Henry I, William of Corbeil, Archbishop of Canterbury, betrayed the rights of the English Church by permitting the Roman legate, Cardinal John de Crema, to convene a synod and to preside at Westminster, in 1126, in such a haughty manner as to call forth indignant protests of the bishops and barons. Rome shrewdly made Canterbury *Legatus natus*. (*Angl. Br.*, 190.)

Henry, Bishop of Winchester, in his capacity as Pope's Legate, deposed his own brother, King Stephen, from the throne.

Up to the time of Gregory VII it had been the custom to get the Emperor to confirm the election of the Pope; now a deputation was sent to the Pope to confirm the election of the King of the Romans, the future Emperor Lothar, in 1125. (Robertson, *Growth*, 225.)

Frederick I Barbarossa held the stirrup of Pope Hadrian I, Nicholas Breakspear, and thus admitted superiority of the Pope over the Emperor. Cardinal Roland, the Pope's envoy, asked, "From whom, then, does the Emperor hold his crown, if not from the Pope?" Basing on the "Donation of Constantine," Pope Hadrian claimed all islands, and accordingly gave Ireland to Henry II of England — for a tribute, of course. On the same principle, three centuries later, Pope Alexander VI parceled out America among the Spaniards and the Portuguese.

Eugene III, 1145—1153, said the Lord gave to Peter, the heavenly porter, the rights of the heavenly and of the earthly kingdom.

St. Bernard of Clairvaux said, Both swords belong to the Church: one to be used *by* her, the other *for* her; one by the *hand*, the other by the *nod* of the priest. (Hauck, *Der Gedanke*, 33. 35.)

The Pope increased his power by Letters Expectative; by

Mandates; by Provisions, begun by Hadrian IV, 1154—1159, and by filling vacancies on death at Rome. (*Angl. Br.*, 233.)

Besides the appeals to Rome by Archbishop Becket and King Henry II, the murder of Becket in his own cathedral on December 29, 1170, by four knights of the King, gave Pope Alexander III a good opportunity to exalt Rome and humiliate the King of England. The Pope also defeated Frederick Barbarossa at Legnano, on May 29, 1176, and in St. Mark's Square at Venice, in July, 1177, the Emperor kissed the Pope's toe, immortalized in a great fresco in the Doges' Palace; it is even said that the Pope put his foot on the neck of the Emperor.

Alexander III gave his blessing to the new Portuguese kingdom of Alfonso I and in a solemn bull rejected the claims of Castile and Leon. He held a great synod, in 1179, in the Lateran; his power was just below the highest point. The Lateran Synod of 1179 decreed that at visitations archbishops might bring 50 horses, cardinals 25, bishops 20 to 30, archdeacons 5 to 7, deacons only 2.

When Lothario Conti became Pope Innocent III, in 1197, he wrote: "The royal power borrows all its dignity and splendor from the pontifical," as the moon from the sun. Again: "The Church without the Pope were a body without a head." In his consecration sermon from Luke 12, 42, he said, "I sit on high above kings and above all princes. For of me it is written in the prophets (Jer. 1, 10): This steward is the viceroy of God, the successor of Peter; he that standeth in the midst between God and man. He is the judge of all, but is judged by no one." Again: "I have not wed my bride, the Church, dowerless; she has indeed brought me priceless gifts, fullness of spiritual and abundance of temporal possessions. As mark of the temporal she has given me the diadem; the miter is the sign of the sacerdotal. The crown for establishing me vicar of the kingdom of Him on whose garments and on whose thighs was writ King of Kings, Ruler of Rulers." (B. Willard-Archer, 84. 85.)

Innocent said the difference between Popes and kings is the difference between the sun and the moon, and a commentator figures out that the Pope is 1744 times more exalted than the emperors and all kings.

The Pope declared that the empire had been transferred from the Greeks to the Germans by papal authority, and he claimed the right of "principally and finally" disposing of the imperial crown.

Innocent III declared that "Christ had committed the whole world to the government of the Popes." "I alone enjoy the plenitude of power, so that others may say of me next to God, 'And of his fullness have we received.'" (*Angl. Br.*, 93.)

Ere this every bishop called himself the vicar of Christ; now the Pope arrogated that title to himself alone; he alone was now the successor, not of an apostle only, but of Christ, the almighty Ruler of the world. The kingly priest became a priestly king; like the Caesars of old, the Pope was now the Emperor and also the Pontifex Maximus.

Pope Innocent III sanctioned the establishment of a Latin empire at Constantinople, with a Latin patriarch and clergy intruded to the exclusion of the hated Greek hierarchy.

The Pope compelled Philip Augustus of France to submit and do tardy justice of his Queen Ingelburga, a Danish princess, who had been supplanted by Agnes of Merania.

In England, in 1213, the Pope forced Stephen Langton into Canterbury despite the rights of the Church and the crown, and he forced John Lackland to resign his crown into the hands of the legate Pandulf and receive England and Ireland from the Pope for a heavy yearly tribute of 1000 marks.

Innocent III was called the most insatiable of mortals by a French chronicler, and Walther von der Vogelweide raged in noble indignation against the collection sticks which the Pope had sent into Germany to procure him money. (Krueger, 129.)

When John Lackland gave his kingdoms into the hands of Innocent III, the Pope praised him for acting inspired by God. To the great gain of the realm and the Church both are now united as soul and body in the hand of Christ's vicar. The Pope's ideal was the direct rule of the world.

And yet, in the quarrel between Philip of France and the English king, the Pope shrank from acting according to his principles.

Pope Innocent III became the real founder of the States of the Church. (Doellinger, in Acton's *Hist. Freedom*, 354.)

Pope Innocent ruled in Portugal, not King Sancho. Peter of Aragon and also the Prince of Bulgaria received their crowns from the Pope. Emperor Frederick II, a mere boy of seventeen, marched into Germany to carry out the sentence of excommunication against Otto the Guelf, and in the Golden Bull of Eger, in 1213, acknowledged all the spiritual and temporal claims of the Pope with the assent of the princes.

Under Innocent III the hellish Inquisition arose, and the devilish slaughter of heretics began and went on for three hundred years. Men would earn heaven by laying waste the earth. Says the leader of the war against the Albigenses: "Neither sex, nor age, nor rank have we spared; we have put all to the sword."

The height of the papacy was reached in the Fourth Lateran Council, in 1215, the greatest ecclesiastical assembly the world has ever seen. It was attended by far more than a thousand delegates and also by envoys of the temporal powers. This council officially formulated the doctrine of transubstantiation and demanded confession at Easter, cursed and damned all heretics, and forced the secular powers to swear to root out all whom the Pope would point out as heretics.

De Maistre compared the Church in the time of Charles the Great to an ellipse, with the Pope in one of the foci and the Emperor in the other. But in the days of Innocent III it had become a circle, and in the governing center stood the

Pope. The reign of Innocent III was one unclouded display of the glory of the popedom. He ruled the kings of France and of England; he compelled a citizen of Pisa to restore goods mortgaged on the receipt of the money, and he decided the case of a simple maiden of Ferretino for whose hand two lovers contended.

Ranke writes (*Hist. Popes* I, 22): "After long centuries of confusion . . . the independence of the Roman See, and that of its essential principle, was finally attained. The position of the Popes was at this moment most exalted; the clergy were wholly in their hands. In the beginning of the twelfth century Provost Gerohus ventured to say: 'It will at last come to this, that the golden image of the empire shall be shaken to dust; every great monarchy shall be divided into tetrarchates, and then only will the Church stand free and untrammelled beneath the protection of her crowned high priest.'"

Innocent III could boast with more justice than the proud Assyrian: "By the strength of my hand I have done it, and by my wisdom; for I am prudent: and I have removed the bounds of the people, and have robbed their treasures, and I have put down the inhabitants like a valiant man. And my hand hath found, as a nest, the riches of the people; and as one gathereth eggs that are left, have I gathered all the earth; and there was none that moved the wing, or opened the mouth, or peeped." Is. 10, 13, 14.

Greater than the pagan Roman empire at its greatest height was the papal Roman Church in the 13th century, including Italy, Sicily, Spain, France, Germany, Hungary, Poland, England, Ireland, Scotland, Scandinavia, Iceland, the Eastern Empire, and Palestine. This vast extent was widened by missions among the Slavs, Prussians, Finns, and Mohammedans in Sicily and Spain; among the Tartars, Mongols, and Moslems in Asia; among the Mohammedans in Africa; and, in America, in Iceland, Greenland, and "Vineland"—possibly even on the New England coast. (Flick, 573.)

In 1215 the papal penitentiary, or court, originated at

Rome, grounded on the "power of the keys," having original and appellate powers of first instance and last resort, composed of a body of canonists and theologians.

Excommunication and the interdict were powerful weapons to increase the power of Antichrist.

The College of Cardinals was created in 1059; foreigners were first appointed in the 13th century; the red hat was given by Innocent IV in 1245; the purple robe by Boniface VIII in 1297; the white horse, red cover, and golden bridle by Paul II in 1464; the title of "Eminence" was added by Urban VIII in 1630. (Flick, 580.) Since Sixtus V, 1586, this college numbers seventy; the Cardinal Secretary of State arose in the beginning of the 15th century, and the partition into Home and Foreign dates from 1833. (Schick, 115.)

Auricular confession was fully developed by the time of Innocent I, 402—417, and required of all members at least once a year by Innocent III after 1216. The Synod of Toulouse, in 1229, insisted on compulsory confession at Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost. It was the bridle by which the people were led, and it gave tremendous power to the Pope. Honorius III, 1216—1227, ordered kneeling before the host. During the 13th century the communicants were deprived of the cup, earnestly opposed by Leo I, Gelasius I, and Paschalis II.

Gregory IX compared Emperor Frederick II with the Beast of the Apocalypse, accused him of treachery to the Church, of perjury, of heresy, and blasphemy, and excommunicated him.

Gregory was the great patron of the Mendicant Monks, and he transferred to the Dominicans the powers of inquisition, hitherto exercised by the bishops, 1232. Does not Constantine's Donation prove, wrote Gregory, that he to whom God has given the direction of heavenly things, shall also rule over earthly things? "Vicar of Christ" was not strong enough for Gregory IX; he preferred the more sonorous title, "Vicar of Almighty God."

The papal Canon Law that culminates in this claim was

officially put together for the first time by Gregory, 1234. When Raphael, at the command of Julius II, decorated the hall in which the Pope's mandates were sealed, he immortalized the granting of the Canon and the Civil Law in two pictures: on the left Emperor Justinian is handing the Roman code to Tribonian, on the right Gregory IX gives his code to one of his jurists. What Gelasius said, and Gregory VII repeated to William of England, appears to be coming true—the state receives its light from the papacy as the moon from the sun.

Kings holding their realm as a fief of the Pope paid him a yearly sum of money, *e. g.*, England, Poland, Norway, Sweden, Naples, Aragon, Portugal. The Peter's Pence paid by every house of Northern Europe was also a sort of feudal tax to the Pope.

The Pope furthermore demanded the tenth of all church incomes whenever he needed the money, *e. g.*, during the crusades, first in France, in 1188. (*Realencyc.* I, 94.)

Since 1181 the Pope had an income from cloisters and exempt bishoprics, since 1230 for renewals of provisions he might cancel. In 1305 Clement V demanded the first year's salary of all bishops in England, in 1319 John XXII that of the whole world. From this developed the papal annates.

Henry III offered Gregory IX, 1227—1241, the "tenth" of all church benefices as a bribe to confirm Richard Grant, Chancellor of Chichester, as Archbishop of Canterbury. These payments the Pope claimed as an annual tax due him. In 1245 Earl Bigod headed English barons to the Council at Lyons to complain to Pope Innocent IV of the extorting of large sums of money and thrusting foreigners into English benefices, who received at least 60,000 marks yearly, more than the king himself. (*Angl. Br.*, 260.)

In 1250 Bishop Grosseteste of Lincoln protested before the Pope himself at Lyons against the shameful and simoniacal practices carried on in England for the benefit of the Pope. He also called attention to the fact that the king's revenue

was only one-third of the enormous sum yearly extorted by the Pope from England. (*Angl. Br.*, 258.)

Under Edward III, who died 1377, the Pope's yearly revenue from England was five times greater than the income of the crown. A secret society of armed men was formed to punish the Pope's legates, representatives, and collectors, and they professed themselves "ready to die rather than be plundered by the Romans." (*Angl. Br.*, 237. 238.)

The Church actually owned about one-third of Germany; nearly one-fifth of France; the greater part of Italy; a large section of Christian Spain; about one-third of England; important regions in Scandinavia, Poland, and Hungary. (Flick, 574.)

In Goethe's "Tasso" Alphons says to Antonio:

He that has his master's interests at heart
In Rome has a very hard stand:
For Rome will ever take, and never give;
If you go there to receive
You get nothing, unless you bring,
And happy, if you will then get something.

In "Faust" Goethe says, "The [Roman Catholic] Church has a good stomach, has devoured whole countries, but has never overeaten, can alone digest unrighteous goods."

The clerical chancellor wrings one concession after the other from the Emperor, who at last says, "I may as well sign over my whole kingdom."

In 1231, in a bull, the Pope settled the constitution of the newly founded University of Paris, where studied Thomas Aquinas, who fixed the idea of the world-rule of the papacy from a theological point of view, and gave to papal infallibility a dogmatic basis on the strength of the Gregorian Canon Law, and of a forgery which he accepted as genuine, and which led him to believe that the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries had already supported the doctrine. He also penned the proposition that subjection to the Pope is necessary to salvation. That is the limit.

In 1250 Gratian, a Camaldolensian monk and professor at Bologna, published the "Decretum Gratiani," a scientific digest of all canon laws, which soon took the place of all others.

The Council of Lyons, in 1245, resolved to celebrate the octave of the birth of the Virgin Mary.

Pope Urban V, in 1264, instituted the festival of Corpus Christi.

At the Synod of Lyons, in 1274, Confirmation was made a sacrament.

Boniface VIII, 1294—1303, was the first to give the shape of a crown to the papal miter.

As in heathen Rome the pontifical and imperial dignitaries were united in one person, so now Boniface appeared the first day in pontifical garb, in vestments similar to the classic ones worn by the emperors in celebrating Jovinian or Ceres feasts, and the next day he appeared in the insignia of the emperor at some state function. (B. W.-A., 85.)

(To be concluded.)

Milwaukee, Wis.

W. DALLMANN.

MISCELLANY.

The "Christian Observer" has for some time been publishing articles by Dr. Gonzalez. In its issue of November 23 it introduces him again, as follows:

Roman Catholics of America have formulated plans for the celebration of their first American Congress in Washington about the first of December. At this Congress they intend, by making a great national show of their strength, which is more apparent than real, to impress and influence American people, especially the politicians. They desire that they shall be regarded as the most numerous denomination in the country, and also the best organized denomination which, through its varied ramifications, can successfully defeat or make victorious a political leader in times of elections. In order that the position of the Roman Catholic Church with regard to the public press may be clearly set forth, we are publishing in this

issue an article by Dr. Juan Orts Gonzalez in which he shows how the public press is dominated by the Roman Catholics. Dr. Gonzalez was formerly a Franciscan friar and a Roman Catholic priest. He renounced his church after a thorough study of its history and doctrine. In the *Christian Observer* of July 27 last, there was published an article under the title, "Why I am a Protestant," in which Dr. Gonzalez gave his reasons for leaving his church.

In his article on the thralldom of the secular press of America, Dr. Gonzalez recounts his experience at Laredo where a libelous pamphlet was handed to people who had attended his lecture. The pamphlet, which bore the approbation of the Roman bishop, abused in unmeasured terms Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Bucer, Beza. Continuing, Dr. Gonzalez says:—

Unsophisticated American Protestants believe that American Catholics know too much of Protestantism to indulge themselves in such false and slanderous language as that quoted above. These certainly overlook the fact that to-day in America ninety per cent. of the teachers in the Catholic universities, academies, colleges, and parochial schools are foreign friars and nuns who come here from Italy, France, Ireland, etc., and bring with them the same methods of instruction and books which they use elsewhere in teaching. I have at hand some of their official text-books in which they speak of Protestantism in the same terms as those quoted above.

Besides that, we have all seen quite recently two famous instances which illustrate our subject wonderfully. Every one who has been reading the *North American Review* attentively of late saw the slanderous denunciation of Methodists in Rome by Archbishop Ireland, and also the answer of Rev. Dr. S. M. Vernon. In the former we find not only rough and impolite language, not only inaccuracies and misstatements, but also principally bitter contempt and even scorn of Roman Methodism, while in the latter we discover the utmost dignity and self-restraint, avoiding everything that might be considered impolite, and particularly manifesting the spirit of tolerance and exhibiting the utmost respect and esteem for Catholics in every line of his Christian and sober answer. We reach the same conclusion if we compare the recent un-American, disrespectful, and tumultuous denunciation by Archbishop O'Connell, of Boston, of Roosevelt, and the calm and temperate vindication of Roosevelt given by the *Outlook*.

And to me the most significant and dreadful fact is that Roman Catholics, notwithstanding their abusive language, obtain a national

hearing, while we Protestants, no matter how politely and reasonably we may speak, are slighted and even disregarded by the public press. Compare the papers which from North to South and East to West reproduced Archbishop Ireland's denunciation of the Methodists, for instance, with the number of papers which reproduced the answer of Dr. Vernon, and you will be amazed at the open partiality of the public press in favor of Roman Catholics.

It is pitiful indeed to say so, but it is absolutely true and must be recognized by every one well acquainted with the facts, that to-day Roman Catholics in America can slander Protestantism and Protestant doctrines and people, using the most abusive and slanderous language, and they find the public press ready to cheerfully reproduce their utterances, and we Protestants cannot even defend ourselves against unjust attacks, unless we use the most mild and respectful language, and even then we never obtain a good national hearing.

And such condition of affairs is more sinister when we consider that within the next thirty years more than forty per cent. of the two millions of Roman Catholic children who are now studying in Roman Catholic schools, academies, colleges, and universities will leave the Roman Catholic faith. Here, as everywhere, the Roman Catholic Church loses more than one-third of her membership in every generation. Anybody in America can test the truth of this statement by comparing the millions of Catholic foreigners who come here with the small remnant of those that the Catholic Church afterwards retains. What will become of those who fall away from Rome? How can they even desire to be Christians according to Protestant standards, since they never have heard anything but slanders and denunciations and misrepresentations of Protestantism? They will surely go to increase the already large number of unbelievers. One of the most dreadful religious problems we meet with is the constant augmentation of unbelief. I do not doubt that more than eighty per cent. of the millions of people who are to-day without religion in America have been either Roman Catholics or in intimate touch with Catholics. Roman Catholics many a time do not succeed in retaining all their followers, but certainly they are always successful in filling them with the deepest scorn for the other Christian denominations. I speak advisedly as a man who has had experience with the system, and can present as illustrations thousands of instances and hundreds of reasons.

I am not a pessimist. Perhaps few Protestants can realize the true position, strength, or feebleness of Catholics as I do on account of my old acquaintance with the high dignitaries of the Roman

Church and her plans in America. I do not hesitate to assert that, though Leo XIII condemned solemnly Americanism in his bull twelve years ago, Americanism is yet living among several prominent American churchmen. And unquestionably millions of native-born Catholics will endorse Protestant principles and methods in the very moment they are able to detect the un-American and sinister policy of true Romanism. But at the same time I am obliged to confess, after having gathered many facts, that to-day the words of such men as Gibbons and Ireland, etc., yes, and more, the goings out and comings in of the most common Roman Catholic bishop, weigh more in the estimation of the public press than any Protestant enterprise or project.

How can it be explained that such a nation as this in which from Washington to Roosevelt almost every great man has been a Protestant and almost every glorious achievement has been accomplished by Protestants, and through Protestantism, is to-day so warmly inclined as a whole in favor of Roman Catholics and disregards so openly Protestants? To answer this question satisfactorily is to me one of the greatest and most vital and pressing of Protestant problems.

I have at hand many documents, some of them perhaps unknown to Protestants, which demonstrate the enormous amount of sagacious work done by Catholics to mislead and control the national thought and press and their tremendous success. I will give frankly the results of my investigations in a series of articles if I can find some reliable papers which will consent to publish them, and I bind myself to make use of Catholic authorities and books, some of which are so secret that even in America they cannot be obtained but by a few influential Catholics.

Alongside of the above we place part of an editorial comment on certain demands of the American Federation of Catholic Societies, which appeared recently in the *Indianapolis News*:—

The Federation further asked that Congress amend the postal laws so as to include within the scope of prohibited literature "books, papers, writings, and prints which outrage religious convictions and contain scurrilous and slanderous attacks upon the faith." This demand is wholly inadmissible. For such a law would make Congress the judge of what the faith was, since, unless it knew this, it could not tell whether it had been unwarrantably attacked. In our opinion, detestable as are the forms of literature protested against, it is far better to allow the faith to take care of itself. We would have as

little censorship as possible in this country, and leave abuse of freedom of the press to be dealt with by public opinion and by the courts. In this country there must be the freest discussion of all subjects, including religion. There might be many discussions of religious questions that would be offensive to the more sensitive church people which Congress would have no right whatever to exclude from the mails. In such cases there are, in free countries, always grave differences of opinion. The matter is one that cannot safely be left to the arbitrament of the government. The power is far too great, and the danger of its abuse is quite as great. Infidels have as good a right as any one else to use the mails, for they are citizens, and they pay taxes. And their discussions are not always marked by the moderation which should characterize all utterances on religious subjects.

But no institution in this land can be shielded by the government from criticism as long as the criticism does not go beyond the limits already fixed by law. These no doubt seem too narrow to the radical brethren. "Scurrilous and slanderous attacks upon the faith," or anything else, are to be deprecated. But they must be dealt with in another way than by government censorship. A decision unfavorable in such a case to the complaining party might involve serious political consequences, and bring into politics influences which ought to be kept out. This government must stand, as it has always stood, for a high morality and righteousness, but as a government it has nothing to do with the faith. Its citizens have many faiths, or, rather, many forms of the same faith, all of which must be treated on an equal basis. But beyond this the government ought not to go.

Never before has Rome shown such bold, brazen impudence in the United States, nor has it ever pushed its unreasonable claims with such aggressive violence. On the other hand, never before has "the land of the free and the home of the brave" witnessed such an exhibition of craven cowardice and fawning servility on the part of its leading journalists and statesmen. The mark of the beast is coming to be worn unblushingly by American Protestants, sons of European ancestors whom Rome slaughtered, hanged, burned, or expatriated. A judgment of God upon faithless Protestantism seems imminent.

The following resolutions may serve a good purpose on occasions similar to that which prompted their adoption at St. Louis in October, 1910:—

Whereas the Prohibition Movement is largely guilty of distorting and of perverting that fundamental principle of complete separation of Church and State as taught by the Savior when He said: "Render unto Caesar" (*i. e.*, the State) "the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's," and of Christian liberty as taught by the inspired Apostle, saying: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink;" and

Whereas the Prohibition Movement at present rampant is largely the outgrowth of legalistic agitation on the part of misguided representatives of hysterical religion which man's wisdom teacheth, but which has no foundation in the Word of God; and

Whereas the Prohibition Movement is plainly in conflict with the Savior's spirit, which condemned sin wherever He found it, but furnished wine at a marriage consecration, and selected wine as an element of His Last Supper:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That we, the Conference of Lutheran ministers of the Synodical Conference at St. Louis, Mo., though reprobating with all our might the prevalent abuse of liquor and of the liquor traffic, and though endorsing all proper measures for the betterment and for the prevention of the existing deplorable conditions, do nevertheless for the reasons aforestated declare ourselves against the present Prohibition agitation as such. —

The last two words, "as such," in these resolutions might be dropped, because the authors' idea is fully expressed by the term "present," qualifying "Prohibition." The addition of these words in a hurried reading of the resolutions might convey the meaning that the authors oppose *any* prohibition movement as such, which, of course, they do not. These resolutions do not attack a prohibition movement—which it is possible to conceive—that would be free from all the obnoxious features named above, and with which a Christian, as a citizen, might cooperate without prejudice to his Christian standing and without detriment to his faith.

We append to the above a set of resolutions covering the same subject, which were adopted by the Western District of the Missouri Synod at its Convention at Concordia, Mo., during October, 1910:—

“A campaign for and against prohibition is at present being waged in our State. As a church body we do not intend to participate in this movement; neither do we purpose to dictate to the conscience of our Christians how they are to cast their vote. We believe that Church and State have entirely different functions, and these must not be confused.

“Since, however, various church denominations have dragged religion into this purely political question, and since our Christians in consequence of misinterpretation of Scripture by the Prohibition agitators are perturbed and confused and raise the question, whether or not the use of alcoholic beverages is incompatible with the tenets of Christianity, we hereby desire to state briefly the Bible’s position respecting this important question.

“We declare that the Bible forbids and condemns the abuse of liquor. Prov. 23, 29, 30: ‘Who hath woe? who hath sorrow? who hath contentions? who hath babbling? who hath wounds without cause? who hath redness of eyes? They that tarry long at the wine; they that go to seek mixed wine.’ Prov. 20, 1: ‘Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging; and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise.’ Eph. 5, 18: ‘And be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess.’ Rom. 13, 13: ‘Let us walk honestly, as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness.’ Gal. 5, 21: ‘Drunkenness, revelings, and such like, of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.’ 1 Cor. 6, 9, 10: ‘Neither drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God.’—The Word of God therefore warns against the abuse of liquor, shows us what fearful woe and misery follow it, and that it ruins man physically, mentally, and spiritually. Yea, the Lord threatens the drunkard with eternal condemnation and the exclusion from His heavenly kingdom.

"On the other hand, the Bible permits and sanctions the judicious and temperate use of liquor.

"We observe our Savior attending a wedding feast where wine was served, and we see Him changing water into real wine, John 2, 1—11. When our Savior partook of the pass-over with His disciples, during which wine was served, He Himself gave the wine to His disciples, as we read Luke 22, 17: 'And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and said: Take this, and divide it among yourselves.' And thereupon He made use of this wine in the administering of the Holy Supper. The Psalmist (Ps. 104) meditates upon the wonderful providence of God in providing wine, oil, and bread (vv. 14. 15): 'He causeth the grass to grow for the cattle, and herb for the service of man, that he may bring forth food out of the earth; and wine that maketh glad the heart of man, and oil to make his face to shine, and bread which strengtheneth man's heart.' The Lord therefore provided wine for the purpose of making glad the heart of man. 1 Tim. 4, 4. 5: 'Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified by the Word of God and prayer.' In the following chapter Paul then says to Timothy (ch. 5, 23): 'Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities.'

"It is therefore clearly a matter of Christian liberty to use wine and other alcoholic beverages, and no one dare say, You sin, if you use it. If anyone would deprive us of this Christian liberty and condemn as a sin the use of spirituous liquors, we retort with St. Paul: 'Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink,' Col. 2, 16.

"This liberty, however, does not in any manner justify the existence of offensive and obnoxious saloons and the abuse of the liquor traffic, which are to a large extent responsible for drunkenness and concomitant evils, and which certainly are to be emphatically denounced."

BOOK REVIEW.

KOMMENTAR UEBER DEN BRIEF PAULI AN DIE EPHESESER. Von
Dr. G. Stoeckhardt, Professor am Concordia-Seminar zu
 St. Louis. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.
 1910. 264 pages. Price, \$1.25.

Shedd, in his *Homiletics* (p. 16 f.), quotes a remark of Niebuhr, of which he says that it "deserves to be perused annually by every student, secular or sacred." "Exegesis," says Niebuhr, "is the fruit of *finished* study. Do not read"—Niebuhr is addressing a young philologist—"the great authors of classical antiquity, in order to make aesthetic reflections upon them, but in order to drink in their spirit, and fill your soul with their thoughts,—in order to gain that by reading which you would have gained by reverently listening to the discourses of great men. This is the philology which does the soul good; and learned investigations, even when we have got so far as to be able to make them, always occupy an inferior place. We must be fully masters of grammar (in the ancient sense); we must acquire every branch of antiquarian knowledge, as far as lies in our power; but even if we can make the most brilliant emendations, and explain the most difficult passages at sight, all this is nothing, and mere sleight of hand, if we do not acquire the wisdom and spiritual energy of the great men of antiquity,—think and feel with them." Niebuhr is speaking of philological studies applied to profane literature. Theology, also exegetical theology, is *habitus practicus θεολόγος*; but this habitude and aptitude is not concrete or inborn. *Theologus non nascitur*,—except by the new birth. Nor is this habitude infused, inspired, or in some direct and immediate manner bestowed by God upon the theologian. It is an acquired habitude. *Theologus fit*. And that by a slow, laborious, and painful process. In the true theological method *meditatio* will ever occupy a very prominent place. And meditation, study, research, must be as painstaking, patient, and unwearied in the student of sacred as of profane literature. Accordingly, Shedd rightly applies Niebuhr's remark to studies such as our author puts before us, and says: "Precisely this is the aim and influence of Biblical philology and exegesis. The theologian and preacher, by his patient study of the written revelation, must gain that by reading which he would have gained by reverently listening to the discourses of the prophets, and apostles, and the incarnate Son of God. And this is the uniform effect of close linguistic investigation. The power of a grammarian is a *vernacular* power. Turn, for illustration, to the commentaries of some of the Greek

Fathers, such as Theodoret and Chrysostom, for example, and observe the close and vivid contact which is brought about between their minds and those of the sacred writers, by reason of their homebred knowledge of the Greek language. These commentators are not equal to some of the great Latin Fathers, in respect to the insight that issues from a profound dogmatical comprehension of Christian truth. So far as interpretation rests upon the analogy of faith and a comprehensive system, (?) Chrysostom is inferior to Augustine. But in regard to everything that depends upon the *callida junctura verborum*, upon the subtle nexus of verbs, nouns, and particles, these exegetes who were 'native and to the manner born,' must ever be the resort and the guide of the Biblical student."

In the volume before us, as also in the larger Commentary on Romans, which preceded this one in 1907, we find much of what has been said above realized. It is "finished study," the ripe fruit of a life-effort, that is laid before us in the fascinating pages of this book. Everywhere the calm assurance with which the signification of a term, the thought, or the shading of a thought, in a clause, or the scope and argument of a paragraph, is set forth, strikes the reader as knowledge that could have been gained only by long-continued observation. And this knowledge is characterized not only by wide grasp of revealed truth, the instinctive consciousness that a certain inspired thought connects with a certain other thought elsewhere and otherwise expressed, but there is also constant and scrupulous attention to detail. The position of a certain term in a clause is felt to be of moment; the force of a variant reading is weighed; synonyms and antonyms, moods and tenses, are being closely examined. And what is best of all, this labor, which represents the mechanical side of exegesis and often renders exegetical works dry and lifeless, is performed in an unobtrusive manner. Etymological, syntactical, rhetorical, critical reflections are ever kept well in the background. It is the thought, the doctrine, that is marshaled before us. The Spirit who "spake by the prophets" issues from the text, and we hear Him speak to us deep, great, transcendental matters,—and we forget that He is speaking through an interpreter, so well the interpreter conceals himself. This is the very best method in exegesis, far superior to the fragmentary method which snatches a word from the text, pins a more or less illuminating remark to it, and drops it; then takes up another, and a third, and so on, until you are surrounded with exegetical odds and ends, and begin to wonder whether it is really a commentary that you are reading, and not rather the inventory which a wrecking crew has made of a demolished building.

Theology is *habitus practicus*. It is to serve the issues of the life that now is, and of that which is to come. The peace of the soul which passes all understanding must result from every genuine theological effort. It must be originated, preserved, and guided to its consummation in glory by every task which a theologian undertakes. The commentary before us is not merely an intellectual feat designed to increase our knowledge and exercise our judgment, but it is a compend of practical wisdom by which the child of God is made to know and appreciate his spiritual genesis and divinely appointed destiny. The awful conflict between sin and grace, reason and faith is recognized throughout the book as an ever present reality with the Christian. For this conflict the book seeks to arm the Christian, with the knowledge that is spiritually discerned, and with the patience and hope of the saints.

The theologian is not only the teacher, but also the defender of Scripture. Errors, old and new, are arraigned in this commentary. It is astonishing how well read the author is in the exegetical literature which exists to-day on the Epistle to the Ephesians. Not only in the introductory chapters, on the author and addressees of the Epistle, the time and place of writing, and the occasion and purpose which prompted the apostle to write, but throughout the commentary proper, the author meets the views of commentators who have preceded him, and registers either his assent or dissent. Thus he is inclined to accept the conventional division of the Epistle into a dogmatical (ch. 1—3) and a parenetical part (ch. 4—6). But he holds that it is not quite correct to characterize the contents of the First Part as a breviary of Pauline theology, or as a grateful acknowledgment of the rich blessings of Christianity, or as a panegyric on the glory of the redemption which is in Christ Jesus. He is convinced, on closer inspection, that a very special theme is carried out in both parts of the Epistle, all the more general ideas of Paul having been subordinated to this theme. This theme is "the *una sancta*, the one, holy Christian Church." The entire Epistle is a "*Hymnus de ecclesia*." And the author holds that an encomium of this sort is especially appropriate for an Epistle addressed to the congregation at Ephesus, "the secular and ecclesiastical metropolis of Asia."

The commentary is divided into sections, indicated to the author by the progression of the apostle's thought. A translation of each section is placed at the head, and the comment follows. At the end of the first chapter an Excursus on the Doctrine of Election has been inserted, and at the end of the second chapter, one on the Doctrine of Conversion. (See first article in this issue.)

In Eph. 2, 10 the author takes *of* for *ā* (by attraction!) and is

disinclined to find in *προητοίμασεν* a reference to predestination, or to the providential ordering of a Christian's life here in time. He connects *περιπατήσωμεν*, not grammatically, but by the force of the context, with *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, and holds that the good works in which Christians are to walk are "complete and ready at hand" *viz.*, in Christ Jesus. "Wir finden sie vor und brauchen nur in ihnen unsern Wandel zu fuehren." "Unser Wandel in ihm (Christo) ist Wandel in ihnen (den guten Werken)." A beautiful thought, and one that harmonizes well with the process of the daily renewal of a Christian, the daily putting on of the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness, the daily putting on of Christ. And yet we could have wished that at this point the author had been a little more explicit, even at the sacrifice of the unity of his presentation. There is, of course, an essential difference between the *bonum justificum*, the righteousness of Christ, all His works and virtues which become ours by imputation in the justifying act of God, and this patterning of the life of the justified after the example of the Redeemer, by which the justified again and in a different manner appropriate the works of Christ.

We shall add to the excerpt from this Commentary presented on the first pages of this issue, others in future issues, which will exhibit the excellent qualities of this exposition of that Epistle of Paul, which many have called the most beautiful, both as regards conception and diction. We can only urge every one whom this notice reaches to take and read.

KATECHISMUSPREDIGTEN. Von *C. C. Schmidt*, Pastor an der ev.-luth. Gemeinde zum Heiligen Kreuz in St. Louis, Mo. St. Louis, Mo. Concordia Publishing House. Part I, 273 pages. Part II, 136 pages. Price: Parts I and II in one volume, \$2.00; Part II, 85 cts.

The work of Pastor Schmidt, the first part of which was received with great satisfaction in 1905, is now completed. In the First Part the Commandments and the Creed had been treated, the former in 24, the latter in 27 sermons. The Second Part contains 11 sermons on the Lord's Prayer, 5 on Baptism, 3 on the Office of the Keys, and 3 on the Lord's Supper. In most of these sermons the respective portion of the Enchiridion is the text, and the exposition embodies and expands the contents of the Explanation appended to the Enchiridion in the Synodical Catechism. The sermons are clear and striking. The author uses the short sentence, which is specially adapted for addresses to young persons. His application is always keen and direct.

The time-honored catechetical service is falling into disuse. But there will still be a wide use and many opportunities for such plain yet profound statements of the saving truths. We could, for instance, think of no better sermon material to offer to the elements which the missionary gathers about him and out of which he builds up a congregation. The sermons in this book all treat foundation truths of the Christian faith, and they treat them in a manner not easily forgotten.

BROSAMLEIN. Kurze Andachten fuer alle Tage des Jahres. Dem Christenvolke deutscher Zunge dargeboten von *Carl Manthey-Zorn*. St. Louis, Mo. Concordia Publishing House. 452 pages. Price, \$2.00.

For the busy layman in this hurly-burly age no better book of devotion could have been produced. A brief text, half a page of comment, a short prayer, a stanza or two from a standard hymn,—that is the makeup of these meditations. The contents of the expository and hortatory portions are wholesome Lutheran food for the new man. A reverent spirit breathes from the entire book, which, moreover, shows fine pastoral discrimination and tact. Full-page reproductions of famous drawings from old and new masters adorn the book. The entire work is a jubilee offering which the pious author makes to the memory of the sainted Dr. Walther.

Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., announces the following publications:—

1. A doctrinal paper on *Rome and the United States*, submitted to the District Synod of Minnesota and Dakota by Dr. C. Abbetmeyer. 39 pages; 15 cts.

2. A doctrinal paper on *Parish Schools*, submitted to the District Synod of South Dakota by Rev. F. Oberheu. 34 pages; 11 cts.

3. A doctrinal paper on the *Creation*, submitted to the Southern District Synod by Prof. R. Pieper. 34 pages; 11 cts.

4. A doctrinal paper on the *Miracles of the Christian Religion*, submitted to the Atlantic District Synod by Rev. P. Roesener. 72 pages; 20 cts.

5. *Lutheran Annual 1911*. This almanac is a jubilee issue commemorative of the centenary of the birth of Dr. Walther, which will be widely celebrated in the Missouri Synod in 1911. It contains a character sketch and a chronology of the leading events in the life of Dr. Walther. 80 pages; 10 cts.

6. *Amerikanischer Kalender fuer deutsche Lutheraner auf das Jahr 1911*. This companion publication to the foregoing is also a

souvenir of the Walther centenary, the greater portion of the reading matter being devoted to an appreciation of Dr. Walther. 80 pages; 10 cts.

7. An artistically executed and framed medallion portrait of Dr. Walther in three sizes: $4\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, $4\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$, $7\frac{1}{2} \times 9\frac{1}{2}$ in. \$2.40, \$4.32, \$7.68 per dozen, without carriage.

8. *Concordia Publishing House Catalogue 1910—1911*. This bulky book-list of 383 pages evinces the healthy growth of the business of the book concern of the Missouri Synod. The great variety of its contents and their judicious arrangement were a very welcome surprise. Free upon request.

9. Prospectus and Sample Pages of *Concordia Sunday School Lessons*, German and English. This most opportune enterprise of Synod's publication concern should meet with a most cordial reception, not only because of its timeliness, as to which there can hardly be a question, but also because of its able execution. The *Lessons* are published for three grades, Primary, Junior, and Senior. They will treat chiefly Bible History, but the Catechism, too, is to be memorized during the course here outlined. The entire plan is minutely described in the Prospectus, which will be sent gratis to any applicant.—The price for the *Lessons* is so low that their introduction in our circles ought to be assured also on this ground: *Primary*, 15 cts. per annum; for ten or more copies to one address, 14 cts.; 50 copies, 12 cts.; 100 copies, 10 cts.; *Junior and Senior*, 25 cts. per annum; 10 copies to one address, 20 cts.; 50 copies, 18 cts.; 100 copies, 15 cts. The *Primary* is published every three months, *Junior and Senior* every month.

DIE OFFENBARUNG ST. JOHANNIS. Dem Christenvolke mit einfaeltiger Auslegung dargeboten von *Carl Manthey-Zorn*. Zwickau i. S. Druck und Verlag von Johannes Herrmann. 1910. Kl. 8°. 406 pages. Price, \$1.00.

The author of this popular explanation of Revelation possesses the great charisma of an easy and fascinating style. There is not a sentence in this book that will have to be read twice, with knitted brow, to get at its meaning, and the book does not contain a dull page. This despite frequent repetitions and revertings to previous statements by which the author seeks to enable his simple readers to keep the thread of the argument while he advances them another step. Revelation, 'tis true, is in itself an interesting book, and its rich imagery has special attractions for the untutored mind. But there are few explanations of Revelation that will prove interesting to the lay reader. Most of them murder the reader's interest by

detailed exegesis. Rev. Zorn's study of the visions of John is not microscopic. He makes you look at a particular feature of the panorama before you, but he does not stop long at minutiae. His aim is to achieve ensemble effects. Sketching in bold, strong outlines, decently filled in with sufficient detail to give them a lifelike appearance, this, rather than scrupulous attention to fine shading and blending of lines, is the author's forte. It is a book such as laymen will delight to read. — And it is an instructive and edifying book, rightly dividing and justly applying the Word of Truth. It is well adapted for use in private devotion, the author having retained in his explanation the chapter divisions of our Bible. — We add a few remarks on points that will interest the exegete. Nowhere in his explanation does Pastor Zorn attempt a chronological division and sequence of the mysterious events which are paraded before the awe-struck reader in the visions of John. He regards the various visions as an architect or engineer views sectional views of a building or a machine taken from different view-points and at varying angles. The events recorded in various successive visions he treats as parallel in point of time. In the retrospect which he prefixes to his account of the contents of the twentieth chapter he says: Let us "briefly recall what we have seen so far in this sacred picture-book of the Revelation of St. John, as presaging the fortunes of the Church of Christ. It is this: Always and at every stage God the Father sits enthroned in the midst of the congregation of saints (the twenty-four elders), and the Church renders Him honor and testifies of Him through the office of the ministry (the four beasts). Likewise the Holy Spirit with His manifold gifts operates within the Church. And the dominion in the Church has been given to the Lamb, which guides her destinies as recorded in the Book of divine foreordination. Through much tribulation the Church must enter into the kingdom of God. But she will reach, yea, she will reach the end, the glory everlasting. This outcome is secured and guaranteed to her by the Lamb, her Redeemer and Protector, the Lord Jesus Christ, together with the Father and the Holy Spirit. Of this fact the Church is assured again and again, this fact is signified to her by the various images. Tribulations, through which the Church must enter into the kingdom of God, abound. There is physical and spiritual affliction in store for her; her physical afflictions are: persecutions by the secular government and by tyrants, wars, famines, epidemics. Her spiritual afflictions are: heresies inaugurated by false teachers, such as righteousness achieved by works, fanaticism (enthusiasm), rationalism, doctrinal license with its attendant, sectarianism. Besides these physical and spiritual afflictions three special tribulations have

been predicted, which shall come upon the Church, three tribulations in which physical and spiritual afflictions will be combined. The first of these has been interpreted to foreshadow the Arian heresy and persecution; the second and more violent one, the Mohammedan delusion and massacre; and the third and most grievous of all, the Roman papacy, which was exhibited to us in so many visions." (p. 302 f.) — Every expounder of the Apocalypse must take a stand at the crucial twentieth chapter, especially as regards the question: What are the thousand years of quiet that are promised to the Church? Rev. Zorn regards them as "prophetic" or mystical years, which are not to be strictly measured by human standards; they stand for a certain period of long duration, known only to God. Moreover, the thousand years, in the author's judgment, are past. Thus the author will have to be classed with the preterists, and his explanation resembles somewhat the Grotian view, though it presents points of difference. But the most important point in the author's explanation is, that he does not regard the thousand years as an era of *absolute* rest and glory, — not as the conventional millennium, but as a period of *relative* quiet. In fact, the Church's ease during this period is restricted to one point: the check placed upon that malice of Satan by which he incites the *ἔθνη* (Turks in the Orient, infidels of every stripe in the Occident) to open hostility against the Church. At this point the author attempts an ingenious piece of exegesis: he takes *μή — ἔτι*, in ch. 20, 3, in the sense of "nicht noch auch" and appeals to Wahl (*Clavis*: *ἔτι sub B*). So far as we can see, this is the only attempt at learned and professional exegesis in the book. Now, this use of *ἔτι* is a recognized fact; also Wilke-Grimm notes it, thus: . . . "(2) *de gradu et accessione*; c. comparativo, *etiam*, Phil. 1, 9; Hebr. 7, 15; — *de eo, quod restat*, Joh. 4, 35; 7, 33; 12, 35; 13, 33; Matt. 19, 20; Marc. 12, 6; Luc. 18, 22; *de eo, quod accedit, insuper, praeterea*; *ἔτι ἀναξ*, Hebr. 12, 26 s; *ἔτι ἔτι ἡ δύο*, Matt. 18, 16; adde 26, 65; Hebr. 11, 32; *ἔτι δέ, praeterea vero*, Hebr. 11, 26 (Xen., *Mem.* 1, 2, 1; Diod. 1, 74; cf. *Grimm* ad 2 Macc. 6, 4); *ἔτι δὲ καί, praeterea vero etiam*, Luc. 14, 26 t vulg. Grsb. Trg.; Act. 2, 26; *ἔτι τε καί, insuperque adeo*, Luc. 14, 26; Lchm. Trg. W. H.; Act. 21, 28." But Wilke-Grimm himself assumes for *ἔτι μή — ἔτι* in Rev. 20, 3 the ordinary meaning *ne amplius*. A comparison of the above references will show that *ἔτι*, in the sense of "in addition to," rarely is accompanied by a negative. When preceded by *μή*, the most natural rendering for it is, "no longer." Practical reasons, too, might be urged against this view; the really great, phenomenal, marvelous success of the Church antedates the age of Constantine. But we are not disposed to quarrel with the author on an exegetical

finesse like this. His explanation is just as valid as many others we have seen, and far more instructive. It perfectly agrees with the norm of doctrine. We could not, if pressed, suggest a more plausible explanation of this acknowledged *crux*. Altogether, the book of Rev. Zorn is a very good book and deserves to be widely read.

DER BRIEF PAULI AN DIE GALATER, ausgelegt von *Joh. Ph. Koehler*. Milwaukee, Wis. 1910. 143 pages. Price, 75 cts.

This book was originally designed to serve the interests of the class-room. It was to relieve, in a manner, the lecturing professor and the note-taking student. Yielding to an afterthought, the author expanded the material somewhat, to make it serviceable to wider circles. The learned exegetical apparatus has been omitted, the author reserving this part of his exegetical treatment for his oral discourse to the students.—The introduction describes the genesis of Paul's Galatians. The author sketches the construction of the Epistle, as follows:

Paul writes an Epistle, in which he presents to the Galatians the true doctrine of the liberty of a Christian and substantiates the same from Scripture. In doing this, he starts out with the statement that his Gospel is of God. And after showing that its content is liberty from the Law, he finally admonishes his readers to show by their walk in the Spirit that they appreciate this teaching. These thoughts are presented in the following order: Following Greek-Roman custom, the apostle places at the head of his Epistle a greeting, ch. 1, 1—5; this is followed by a general introduction in a manner peculiar to the apostle. He strongly inveighs against the Galatians, because they had allowed themselves to be turned from the Gospel, ch. 1, 6—10. In ch. 1, 11, he begins his weighty discourse, and carries it on to ch. 6, 10. He presents his thoughts in three grand divisions. The First Part embraces ch. 1, 11—2, 21. In this part Paul relates what induced him to take up the preaching of the Gospel, and in what manner he had so far conducted his preaching. He defends the universal scope (Geltung) of the Gospel, and consequently, his own authority as an apostle. He has in no wise derived his office and doctrine from the older apostles, ch. 1, 11—24. On the contrary, those among the apostles who were pillars in the Church readily received him at the Apostles' Council at Jerusalem, ch. 2, 1—10. Yea, Peter had to suffer a strong rebuke by Paul at Antioch in regard to the doctrine which Paul had preached in Galatia, and which was now being attacked by Christian converts from among the Jews, ch. 2, 11—21. The Second Part embraces ch. 3, 1—4, 30. In two sections, which pass over into each other at the center, the apostle propounds the doctrine that a Christian is free from the Law. He proves, in the first place, by four arguments, that salvation is not by the works of the Law, but by faith in Christ, ch. 3, 1—18. He shows next, by three arguments, that the Law has been abolished, ch. 3, 19—4, 30. In the Third Part, ch. 4, 31—6, 10, the apostle, in three sections, exhorts his readers to rightly use their liberty. In the first place, they are to maintain their liberty, ch. 4, 31—5, 12; in the second place, they are to preserve their liberty by a walk in the Spirit, ch. 5, 13—24; in the third place, they are to practice mutual charity,

ch. 5, 25—6, 10. In a concise recapitulation the apostle concludes, finishing his discourse with a benediction. (p. 9 f.)

In the Exposition proper the author calls the main parts: I. The historico-apologetical Part; II. The dogmatical Part; III. The hortatory Part. The subdivisions of these parts are indicated by special headings, and the exposition usually sketches briefly the contents of the section. Next follows a translation of the section, and to this is appended the exposition, which is clear, in places animated, and always aims at setting forth the central fact in the apostle's teaching, Christ, His work, and the effects of that work upon the *credenda* and the *agenda* of a Christian.

LUTHER ON SIN AND THE FLOOD. Commentary on Genesis.

By John Nicholas Lenker, D. D. Vol. II. The Luther Press. Minneapolis, Minn. 1910. Price, \$2.25.

With this latest volume in the "American Luther Series" Dr. Lenker "returns to the spiritual commentaries on the Bible which are the foundation of all writings of Luther." The first volume on Genesis had been issued some time ago. The present volume carries Luther's exposition forward from ch. 4, 8 to ch. 9, 29. By far the greater portion of the volume has been translated by Prof. Schaller of the Wisconsin Synod, which fact, besides the weighty matters discussed in this volume, ought to be a sufficient recommendation of the book.

THE FUNDAMENTALS. A Testimony to the Truth. Vol. II.

Compliments of Two Christian Laymen. Testimony Publication Company. 808 La Salle Ave., Chicago, Ill.

Among the most grateful surprises which this year's book market has brought us we count this enterprise of two Christian laymen who devote their means to the defense of the fundamental truths of the Christian religion. The pleasure afforded by the first volume which they put forth is increased by the contents of the second, which registers the following articles: "The Testimony of the Monuments to the Truth of the Scriptures," by Prof. Geo. Fr. Wright, D. D., of Oberlin College; "The Recent Testimony of Archaeology to the Scriptures," by M. G. Kyle, D. D., of Xenia Theological Seminary; "Fallacies of Higher Criticism," by Franklin Johnson, D. D.; "Christ and Criticism," by Sir Robert Anderson of London; "Modern Philosophy," by Philip Mauro, Counselor-at-Law, of New York; "Justification by Faith," by H. C. G. Moule, D. D., Bishop of Durham, England; "Tributes to Christ and the Bible by Brainy Men not Known as Active Christians."

Our attention was chiefly drawn to Bishop Moule's contribution. It is with genuine delight that we transfer from his article the following excerpts which exhibit the old Biblical and Lutheran conception of Justification and Faith.

By derivation, no doubt, Justification means to make just, that is to say, to make conformable to a true standard. It would seem thus to mean a process by which wrong is corrected, and bad is made good, and good better, in the way of actual improvement of the thing or person justified. In one curious case, and, so far as I know, in that case only, the word has this meaning in actual use. "Justification" is a term of the printer's art. The compositor "justifies" a piece of typework when he corrects, brings into perfect order, as to spaces between words and letters, and so on, the types which he has set up.

But this, as I have said, is a solitary case. In the use of words otherwise, universally, Justification and Justify mean something quite different from improvement of condition. They mean establishment of position as before a judge or jury, literal or figurative. They mean the winning of a favorable verdict in such a presence, or again (what is the same thing from another side) the utterance of that verdict, the sentence of acquittal, or the sentence of vindicated right, as the case may be.

I am thinking of the word not at all exclusively as a religious word. Take it in its common, everyday employment; it is always thus. To justify an opinion, to justify a course of conduct, to justify a statement, to justify a friend, what does it mean? Not to readjust and improve your thoughts, or your actions, or your words; not to educate your friend to be wiser or more able. No, but to win a verdict for thought, or action, or word, or friend, at some bar of judgment, as for example, the bar of public opinion, or of common conscience. It is not to improve, but to vindicate.

Take a ready illustration to the same effect from Scripture, and from a passage not of doctrine, but of public Israelite law: "If there be a controversy between men, and they come unto judgment, that the judges may judge them, then they shall justify the righteous and condemn the wicked," Deut. 25, 1. Here it is obvious that the question is not one of moral improvement. The judges are not to make the righteous man better. They are to vindicate his position as satisfactory to the law.

Non-theological passages, it may be observed, and generally non-theological connections, are of the greatest use in determining the true, native meaning of theological terms. For with rare exceptions, which are for the most part matters of open history, as in the case of the *Homœion*, theological terms are terms of common thought, adapted to a special use, but in themselves unchanged. That is, they were thus used at first, in the simplicity of original truth. Later ages may have deflected that simplicity. It was so as a fact with our word Justification, as we shall see immediately. But at first the word meant in religion precisely what it meant out of it. It meant the winning, or the consequent announcement, of a favorable verdict. Not the word, but the application was altered when salvation was in question. It was indeed a new and glorious application. The verdict in question was the verdict not of a Hebrew court, nor of public opinion, but of the eternal Judge of all the earth. But that left the meaning of the word the same.

JUSTIFICATION A "FORENSIC" TERM.

It is thus evident that the word Justification, alike in religious and in common parlance, is a word connected with law. It has to do with acquittal, vindication, acceptance before a judgment seat. To use a technical term, it is a *forensic* word, a word of the law-courts (which in old

Rome stood in the *forum*). In regard of "us men and our salvation" it stands related not so much, not so directly, to our need of spiritual revolution, amendment, purification, holiness, as to our need of getting, somehow—in spite of our guilt, our liability, our debt, our deserved condemnation,—a sentence of acquittal, a sentence of acceptance, at the judgment-seat of a holy God.

Not that it has nothing to do with our inward spiritual purification. It has intense and vital relations that way. But they are not *direct* relations. The direct concern of Justification is with man's need of a divine deliverance, not from the power of his sin, but from its guilt.

MISTAKEN INTERPRETATIONS.

Here we must note, accordingly, two remarkable instances of misuse of the word Justification in the history of Christian thought. The first is found in the theology of the Schoolmen, the great thinkers of the Middle Ages in Western Christendom—Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, and others. To them Justification appears to have meant much the same as regeneration, the great internal change in the state of our nature wrought by grace. The other instance appears in the sixteenth century, in the Decrees of the Council of Trent, a highly authoritative statement of Romanist belief and teaching. There Justification is described (vi, c. 7) as "not the mere remission of sins, but also the sanctification and renovation of the inner man." In this remarkable sentence the Romanist theologians seem to combine the true account of the word, though imperfectly stated, with the view of the Schoolmen. It is not too much to say that a careful review of the facts summarized above, as regards the secular use of the word Justification, and the Scriptural use of it in the doctrine of salvation, is enough to negative these explanations. They are curious and memorable examples of misinterpretation of terms, that most fruitful source of further, wider, and deeper error. . . .

Faith, in actual common use, tends to mean a *practical* confidence. Rarely, if ever, do we use it of a mere opinion, however distinct, lying passive in the mind. To have faith in a commander does not mean merely to entertain a conviction, a belief, however positive, that he is skillful and competent. We may entertain such a belief about the commander of the enemy—with very unpleasant impressions on our minds in consequence. We may be *confident* that he is a great general in a sense the very opposite to a personal *confidence in him*. No, to have faith in a commander implies a view of him in which we either actually do, or are quite ready to, trust ourselves and our cause to his command. And just the same is true of faith in a divine Promise, faith in a divine Redeemer. It means a reliance, genuine and practical. It means a putting of ourselves and our needs, in personal reliance, into His hands.

Here, in passing, we observe that Faith, accordingly, always implies an element, more or less, of the dark, of the unknown. Where everything is, so to speak, *visible* to the heart and mind there scarcely can be Faith. I am on a dangerous piece of water, in a boat, with a skilled and experienced boatman. I cross it, not without tremor perhaps, but with faith. Here faith is exercised on a trustworthy and known object, the boatman. But it is exercised regarding what are more or less, to me, uncertain circumstances, the amount of peril, and the way to handle the boat in it. Were there no uncertain circumstances, my opinion of the boatman would not be faith, but mere opinion; estimate, not reliance.

"The virtue of Faith lies in the virtue of its Object." That Object, in this matter of Justification, so the Scriptures assure us abundantly and with the utmost clearness, is our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, who died for us and rose again.

One momentous issue from this reflection is as follows: We are here warned off from the temptation to erect Faith into a Savior, to rest our

reliance upon our Faith, if I may put it so. That is a real temptation to many. Hearing, and fully thinking, that to be justified we must have Faith, they, we, are soon occupied with an anxious analysis of our Faith. Do I trust enough? Is my reliance satisfactory in kind and quantity? But if saving Faith is, in its essence, simply a reliant attitude, then the question of its effect and virtue is at once shifted to the question of the adequacy of its Object. The man then is drawn to ask, not, Do I rely enough? but, Is Jesus Christ great enough, and gracious enough, for me to rely upon? The introspective microscope is laid down. The soul's open eyes turn upward to the face of our Lord Jesus Christ; and Faith forgets itself in its own proper action. In other words, the man relies instinctively upon an Object seen to be so magnificently, so supremely, able to sustain him. His feet are on the Rock, and he knows it, not by feeling for his feet, but by feeling the Rock.

Here let us note that Faith, thus seen to be reliance, is obviously a thing as different as possible from merit. No one in common life thinks of a well-placed reliance as meritorious. It is right, but not righteous. It does not make a man deserving of rescue when, being in imminent danger, he implicitly accepts the guidance of his rescuer. And the man who, discovering himself, in the old-fashioned way (the way as old as David before Nathan, Isaiah in the vision, the publican in the temple, the jailor at Philippi, Augustine at Milan), to be a guilty sinner, whose "mouth is shut" before God, relies upon Christ as his all for pardon and peace, certainly does not merit anything for closing with his own salvation. He deserves nothing by the act of accepting all.

"God," says Richard Hooker, in that great "Discourse" of his on Justification, "doth justify the believing man, yet not for the worthiness of his belief, but for the worthiness of Him which is believed." So it is not our attitude which we rely on. Our attitude is just our reliance. And reliance means the going out upon Another for repose.

Once for all let us remember that we may make the falsest use, even under the truest definitions, of both ideas, Justification and Faith. We may think of either of them as the object of our hope, the ultimate cause of our salvation. So thought of, they are phantoms, nay, they are idols. Seen truly, they are but expressions for Jesus Christ, our Lord, as He is given and taken. Justification is no Savior, nor is Faith. Justification by Faith—what is it? It is the acceptance of the guilty by reason of a Trusted Christ.

If a wish could be entertained, we should like to see from the same or from some equally able pen articles on Original Sin, Free Will, the Means of Grace, and the Origin of Faith.

THE POLITICAL THEORIES OF MARTIN LUTHER. By *Luther Hess Waring*, Ph. D. G. P. Putnam's Sons. New York and London. 1910. 293 pages.

"Luther in politics? Impossible!"—we hear a chorus of dissent. The dissent is quite proper, if we place "politics" in quotation marks. The conventional politician of our day and the Saxon Reformer are, indeed, nonfusible substances. But Luther was in politics, in the noblest sense of the term, and in a manner that makes his conduct a wholesome study and an approved pattern for churchmen.—When Luther came, Church and State were so closely allied, owing to the prevailing doctrines and power of the Roman Church, and eccle-

siastical interests were so frequently grafted upon civil issues, while political aims were carried into effect by the aid of religion,—that when Luther raised his protest against the spiritual tyranny of the Roman hierarchy, this purely spiritual act at once raised a host of political questions. Luther's testimony was aimed at spiritual wickedness in high places, but this spiritual wickedness had become embodied in very substantial and material interests. It was like driving out a devil from one obsessed: the demon sought to tear the body which he had inhabited. And the question was how to save the body while getting rid of the demon. The Reformation was not a secular, but a spiritual movement; but it originated under circumstances which caused it to affect the secular interests of men. Moreover, the evangelical doctrine soon came to be wrested to carnal ends by revolutionary and licentious elements. The Peasants' War is, indeed, no part of the Lutheran Reformation, but it is a fact that the seditious peasants themselves sought to connect their wild uproar with the spiritual warfare of Luther. This, too, necessitated the discussion and settlement of quite a number of political questions. Again, the "new faith" had to enter into an extended struggle with the civil powers to gain recognition. The aim of the struggling party was spiritual, but the struggle itself was a political one, into which questions of state, diplomacy, etc., played at every turn. Lastly, the preaching of the evangelical faith was bound to change the ethical views of men in regard to the relations which rulers must hold to their subjects, and to the interests of those whom they govern, also of subjects to their princes, of the members of a commonwealth to one another, of the rich to the poor, the classes to the masses. Hundreds of letters by men in authority in the state were written to Luther, propounding questions of polity, relating to the common weal; and the far-sighted, clear-headed Reformer strove to answer them, always bearing in mind that the business of Caesar was not his real business, but that he owed Caesar service while he was called to the service of God.

Luther's part in the affairs of state, accordingly, was a natural consequence of his religious activity, yea, it was itself religious activity applied to civil affairs. *What Scripture states* regarding the character of the State, the extent and the limits of its authority, its proper domain and functions,—all this Luther proclaimed as he proclaimed other truths of God's Word. Wherever Scripture had rendered no decision, he suspended his judgment, remanded the case to "the jurists," or appealed to the laws of nations, or to reason and experience. It is, therefore, scarcely in keeping with the actual facts in the case to speak of "political theories" of Luther. Luther was

anything rather than a theorist. Nor does the treatise before us exhibit anything that might deserve the name of "theory." It states Luther's *faith* in these matters, and that faith founded upon the declarations of Holy Writ. The author has been careful, in many places, to show how Luther substantiated his teaching, *e. g.*, regarding state-sovereignty, revolution, etc., from Scripture.

The author is well read in Luther's writings. All the leading dissertations of Luther which one would expect to find mentioned in a book of this kind are cited, and the most important of them many times. We have compared about seventy direct references to such writings as these: "Von weltlicher Obrigkeit, wie weit man ihr Gehorsam schuldig sei;" "An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation;" "Die zehn Gebote dem Volk zu Wittenberg gepredigt" (particularly the Fourth and the Seventh Commandments); "Der Grosse Katechismus;" "Bedenken, ob man nach Mose oder kaiserlichen Rechten richten oder urtheilen solle;" "Kirchen-Postille" (23d Sunday after Trinity); "Schrift an Lazarus Spengler, ob man dem Kaiser widerstehen solle;" "Ratschlag, ob ein Fuerst seine Untertanen mit Krieg schuetzen moege;" "Eine treue Vermahnung, sich zu hueten vor Aufruhr und Empoerung;" "Wider die raeuberischen und moerderischen Rotten der Bauern;" "Von der Gegenwehr;" "Warnung an seine lieben Deutschen;" "An die Ratsherren aller Staende Deutschlands;" "Predigt, dass man die Kinder zur Schule halten soll;" "Grosser Sermon vom Wucher;" "Von Kaufhandlung und Wucher;" "Traubuechlein;" "Ob Kriegsleute in einem seligen Stande sein koennen;" "Von der Freiheit eines Christenmenschen," etc. Also many letters of Luther are introduced as evidence, likewise official opinions which he formulated together with other members of the theological faculty of Wittenberg. These writings have not been exhaustively treated, but their contents have usually been sufficiently indicated. The author has accumulated a great deal of material and set up way-marks for further research that may incite others to still deeper study.—The St. Louis Edition of Luther's Works has furnished the author the majority of his references. In quite a number of instances, however, his references are given at second hand.—The book divides into ten chapters: 1. Historical Introduction; 2. The Germany of Luther's Day; 3. The Nature, Necessity, and Origin of the State; 4. The Sovereignty of the State, Viewed Internally; 5. The Sovereignty of the State, Viewed Externally; 6. The Right of Reform and Revolution; 7. The Objects of the State; 8. The Functions of the State; 9. The Limits of the State; 10. An Estimate of Luther's Place in the History of the Theory of the State.—We note, in passing, that in ch. 9 the author repudiates

Mackinnon, whom Romanists love to quote: "It must not be forgotten that to take a different side from Luther in any cause was, *ipso facto*, to incur denunciation." Over and against this view, the author declares: "It is a grave error to say that Luther believed in liberty of thought and speech only for himself, and not for those who disagreed with him." (p. 247 f.) And the evidence for this claim which he introduces from Luther's writings is especially copious. — The strong and the weak points of the author's treatise may both be seen in his

SUMMARY OF LUTHER'S POLITICAL PRINCIPLES.

I. The origin of the state. The state, as natural and necessary to man, is as truly divine in its origin as the creation of man himself; though the nature or the form of government that may be established is a matter of human determination.

II. The sovereignty of the state. The state possesses exclusive coercive authority. To it, in its sovereignty, belongs all legislative, executive, and judicial jurisdiction in temporal affairs. This jurisdiction extends over every individual within the territory of the state — ecclesiastic and heretic included. Status in the church does not affect or determine status in the state. The state does not hold or wield a sword in the interests of the church.

The national state is the natural unit of civil government. Foreign interference—whether ecclesiastical or civil—is not to be tolerated. Every individual is in duty bound to obedience to civil authority, legally constituted and exercised, unless it be a command to do that which is explicitly prohibited by the Word of God.

A government may be constitutionally reformed or altered. Illegal or unconstitutional government may be overthrown. *Ultra vires* commands or acts have no force or validity. Submission is not a duty, and self-defense is a right of the individual in case of tyranny.

III. The objects of the state. The primary object of the state is to protect the good, punish the wicked, and maintain public peace. Civil government is to be conducted in the interests of the governed—not of any particular person or persons, any class or classes, but on behalf of all the people. Whatever the form of government—as Luther expresses no preference—civil authority is a sacred trust. To every man is to be given equal consideration and opportunity, under similar conditions.

IV. The functions of the state. It is the duty of the state to educate its youth not only in the secular field of learning, but also along moral and religious lines. It should care for its poor, protect its subjects against monopolies, extortion, gambling, and public immorality.

V. The limits of the state. Religious and civil liberty—of conscience, speech, and press—are inalienable rights belonging alike to every individual, subject only to the equal rights of others, the maintenance of public peace and order, and the sovereign power of the state over the external life, where it touches the lives of others.

In all these respects, Luther lives yet to-day, for these principles are the fundamental ones in force under the enlightened governments of the world at the beginning of the twentieth century. Nor have we yet fully realized his ideals. Perhaps we never shall. Leopold von Ranke regarded the Reformation as a great political force working political transformations not yet ended. The best thought and the highest political leadership of the age is calling now, not for more, but better government, not wealth for the favored few, not government in the interests of a certain class or classes, but on behalf of the masses and of

the people as a whole. The government itself, in Luther's view, may be by prince or people, but it must be government *for* the people. To this end it is a trust from above.

In the light of his attitude on all these political questions, we must recognize in Luther not merely a prophet, or a forerunner, but the founder of the modern theory of the state; not that he secularized it, but he declared it to be absolutely separate and distinct from the church and the sole possessor of coercive authority and sovereign power; and with this theory of the state, he declares the inalienable liberty of the mind of man, of the human soul, of the individual conscience. "The dearest goods of our estate," says Dr. Hedge, "civil independence, spiritual emancipation, individual scope, the large room, the unbound thought, the free pen, whatever is most characteristic of this New England of our inheritance—we owe to the Saxon reformer. . . . Modern civilization, liberty, science, social progress, attest the world-wide scope of the Protestant reform, whose principles are independent thought, freedom from ecclesiastical thrall, defiance of consecrated wrong."

Luther was a German, but he is claimed to-day by all lands and all civilizations as an epoch-maker, as a beacon light of history, for he is the founder of modern liberty; his "service to mankind was nothing less than the successful declaration of individual freedom of conscience from the dictates of any human authority."

"It is not incorrect to say that Luther has been the restorer of liberty in modern times," says a Roman Catholic historian. "If he denied it in theory, he established it in practice. If he did not create, he at least courageously affixed his signature to that great revolution which rendered the right of examination lawful in Europe. And if we exercise in all its plenitude at this day this first and highest privilege of human intelligence, it is to him we are mostly indebted for it; nor can we think, speak, or write, without being made conscious at every step of the immense benefit of this intellectual enfranchisement. To whom do I owe the power of publishing what I am even now inditing, except to the liberator of modern thought?" (Michelet. — *Ed.*)

The Reformed historian D'Aubigné declares: "Luther was the first to proclaim the great principles of humanity and religious liberty. He was far beyond his own age, and even beyond many of the reformers, in toleration."

The American historian Bancroft asserts: "Luther repelled the use of violence in religion; he protested against propagating reforms by persecution, and with a wise moderation he maintained the sublime doctrine of freedom of conscience."

The secretary to the Catholic Union of Great Britain, the Roman Catholic historian Lilly, assures us that it is not only in the distinctly religious domain that Luther's teaching has been so influential and so far-reaching. He declares that the French Revolutionists were debtors to Luther for that doctrine of the sovereignty of the individual which is the very foundation of Rousseau's *Contrat Social*, and of *The Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen*, formulated by Rousseau's disciples. (Cave canem! — *Ed.*)

The priceless blessings of liberty and the rights of conscience recognized, enjoyed, and guaranteed in our own great republic, and working like leaven among all peoples who do not enjoy them, are, directly and indirectly, the result of the truths and principles so clearly and so forcibly proclaimed by Martin Luther nearly four hundred years ago.

We have found this volume most stimulating, and are confident that no one will regret spending a few nights over its interesting contents.

AUGUSTANA-SYNODENS REFERAT. Femtiofoersta arsmoetet. Synodens 50-ars Jubileum hallet i Rock Island, Ill., den 9.—15. juni 1910. Rock Island, Ill. Augustana Book Concerns Boktryckeri. 456 pages.

This bulky report of the Jubilee Convention of the Augustana Synod contains, 1) a record of the transactions of the synod, pp. 9—236; 2) a record of the transactions of the ministerium, pp. 237—243; 3) supplements, pp. 244—305; 4) statistics, pp. 306—456. — The President's report contains a "Retrospect on the History of the Augustana Synod." Extensive reports of the presidents of conferences, chairmen of mission-boards and boards of charity and especially of the synod's book concern are embodied in these minutes. The receipts of the book concern during 1909 amounted to \$155,871.33; its resources at the end of the year are given at \$219,081.48, with liabilities at \$32,155.66, representing a present net worth of \$183,925.82. The average number of copies printed per week of the leading publications of synod were as follows: *Augustana* (the synodical organ), 15,221; *Barnens Tidning* (the child's paper), 40,458; *Olive Leaf*, 20,216; *Ungdomsvaennen* (Youth's Friend), 7250; *Young Lutheran's Companion* (published at a loss of \$903.53), 4417; *S. S. Textblad*, 6225; *Solstralen*, 6875; *Solglimten*, 7750. Synod's press issued 22 new publications, in a total of 127,800 copies, and 25 reprints, in a total of 72,325 copies. The grand total of all books, smaller writings, and tracts issued by the book concern was 2,195,164. The interesting constitution of the book concern is appended to this report. — The "Association of English Churches," on petition, was granted representation in the Synodical Council, an English abstract of the transactions of Synod and its conferences was ordered, and an English secretary elected. — The Augustana Synod is divided into 8 conferences; the conferences are subdivided into districts, 72 in number, with 3 mission districts additional. — At the close of 1909 the synod numbered 611 ministers, 1124 congregations, 996 churches, 494 parsonages, 166,983 communicants, 258,409 members; its property was valued at \$8,779,764, with an indebtedness of \$1,186,778. There were reported 11,672 baptisms, 8313 confirmations, 1800 deaths of adults. 426 congregations conducted parochial schools with 559 teachers and 18,463 pupils.

THE GENESIS OF THE "NEW MEASURE" MOVEMENT IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN THIS COUNTRY. By *Prof. David H. Bauslin*, D. D.

This reprint from the *Lutheran Quarterly*, July, 1910, is an intensely interesting study of one of the saddest epochs in the history

of the American Lutheran Church. The "new measure" movement coincides with the formation of the General Synod, and was fostered by leaders of the General Synod. This does not mean that the General Synod originated the movement, but it does mean that the General Synod, to a large extent, lacked the Lutheran consciousness and clearheadedness necessary to detect the gross aberration from Lutheran teaching and practice which the movement represented, and to repel it with a hearty Lutheran disgust. It means that the General Synod subjected the American Lutheran Church to the humiliation of being publicly reprimanded for silliness by men outside of her pale.—The "new measure" movement is, in our opinion, responsible for most of the misfortunes which have betided the General Synod during the ninety years of its existence. It is responsible for the disintegration which began in this body in the sixties. It is responsible for the General Synod's reputation for unsoundness, laxity, indifference, and outspoken hostility to genuine Lutheranism. It is responsible for the comparatively slow growth, externally and internally, of the General Synod. Under normal conditions and with proper guidance the entire American field should be occupied to-day by one synod, and that synod the General Synod. There should have been no need of a General Council, nor of the later Western synods. The history of the Lutheran Church, humanly speaking, would read altogether differently from what it does, had the older synods preserved their Lutheran heritage uncorrupted.—Dr. Bauslin's brochure is distinguished in a high degree for candor. He is chronicling the shame of his synod, but he is brave and honest enough to do so without a whimper or maudlin apology. Such statements are bound to do good and win respect for the General Synod. Would that similar spokesmen had arisen half a century ago! As it is, it will take a long time for earnest men in the General Synod to live down the reputation of their forbears and to overcome un-Lutheran tendencies still strong in that body. All lovers of the Lutheran faith can only wish every such effort a hearty Godspeed.—A word in conclusion: The censure applied to the General Synod by the Missouri Synod has often been decried as bigoted and insincere, emanating from conceit and dictated by exclusivism. In a world in which bias is a universal fault even honest criticism is seldom taken in good part. But with a treatise like Dr. Bauslin's before them it should not be impossible, we imagine, for General Synod men to conceive the utter loathing with which Lutherans, who were privileged by God's grace to hold the old faith of our Church in pure form, had to view practices which were rampant in the General Synod, and how shocking certain statements of doc-

trine or church polity made by the General Synod must have appeared to these men. Let these men yet be given credit for endeavoring to be a salt in an age of corruptness in doctrine and practice! If conditions in the General Synod are, in the opinion of some of its present leaders, not properly estimated to-day by Missourians, it can only be because the evidence furnished is not convincing. But such acknowledgments of past error, coupled with the evident desire to avoid the same in the future, is the very best kind of evidence that there are men in the General Synod who discern the right and mean to advocate it. May their tribe increase and conquer! But the road to victory is not by a return "to historical methods of the seventeenth century pietists" (p. 32), but to the Lutheran Confessions in their final form, of 1580.

THE AUGUSTANA SYNOD. A Brief Review of its History, 1860—1910. Rock Island, Ill. Augustana Book Concern. 267 pages.

This is the English companion to the Swedish "Minneskrift," noticed in our last issue. Its contents are parallel to those of the Swedish publication. In this publication, too, the various chapters have been treated by different writers. Dr. Johnston has been charged with the editing of the whole. The book is abundantly illustrated. We have noticed elsewhere Prof. Blomgren's jubilee compliments to our Synod in the chapter on "The Union of the Augustana Synod with the General Council." Merely as a matter of record we transfer his remarks to these pages: "We escaped the bitter experience of our Norwegian brethren, who affiliated with the German Missouri Synod, and *found themselves entangled soon, not only in the Predestination Error, but also in the heartless dogmatic orthodoxy and objectivism of that Synod, and in the self-satisfied exclusivism of that body,*" (italics by the author!) "which, to most of our Norwegian brethren at last became unbearable, and compelled them to withdraw and form an organization of their own." (p. 226.)

ZUR SPRACHE UND GESCHICHTE DES KLEINEN KATECHISMUS.
Von Johannes Gillhoff. Leipzig. 1909. Price, M. 1.60.

If any of our teachers or pastors have forty to fifty cents to invest in a brochure that is full of instruction in every paragraph and at the same time affords most delightful reading matter—here is the book. The grammar of Luther's Enchiridion, its etymological forms, its syntactical construction, its general makeup as a literary composition, in a word, its external form,—surely, this seems the

driest subject imaginable. We remember having read books on this subject that were excessively learned and — soporific. This brochure of 116 pages is learned too, very much so, but its author lays before us his keen and searching observations in such a lively, breezy, even humorous vein, that *taedium* is impossible during its perusal. He does not discuss the doctrinal contents but, as stated, merely the form of Luther's Small Catechism. But every one who has pursued studies of this kind knows that it is impossible to discuss the form of a composition without shedding some light on its thought and meaning. The author is an unqualified admirer of Luther's style. And what he says about Luther's nervous style deserves to be heeded in our day. The Second Part of this brochure is an inquiry into the original prints of the Enchiridion and the preservation of the original text during nearly four hundred years. The finds of Moenckeberg, Th. Harnack, Buchwald, and Albrecht are described in this part. In an appendix the author presents the "augmented and emendated" Wittenberg edition of 1529.

PRAEPARATION ZU DEN KLEINEN PROPHETEN mit den noetigen, die Uebersetzung und das Verstaendnis des Textes erleichternden Anmerkungen. I. Die Propheten Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadja, Jona. Herausgegeben von Karl Zimmer. Halle, 1895.

This is a student's aid for the study of the Old Testament writings indicated. The body of the pamphlet is taken up by the vocabulary, chapter for chapter, and verse for verse. Grammatical explanations are given in the footnotes.

ROME vs. AMERICA. A Note of Warning to All Loyal American Citizens Respecting the Danger Which Threatens our Free Institutions from the Anti-American Principles of the Roman Catholic Church. By D. A. Sommer. 7th Thousand. Published by the Octographic Review, Indianapolis, Ind. 1910.

This tract of 42 closely printed pages contains "Open Letters to Cardinal Gibbons on Roman Catholicism and American Liberty." It was "formerly published under the title, 'Letters to Roosevelt on Romanism,' but has been changed somewhat so as to be more permanent in form. It has been doubled in size, with the same kind of facts which characterized the other booklet." The following subjects are presented in this tract: 1. Rome is opposed to the freedom of

speech and of the press; 2. ditto of conscience and worship; 3. ditto to our non-sectarian school-system; 4. ditto to the separation of Church and State; 5. Rome is influencing our politicians; 6. Rome will do anything to accomplish her purpose; 7. The reasons loyal Americans should not vote for a Roman Catholic; 8. Fairbanks, Roosevelt, and the Pope; 9. Startling facts concerning Roman Catholicism. — Roman authorities are cited throughout. The style is clear and the argument effective. — Our readers will readily recognize an unpleasant incident, which still awaits honorable adjustment, in the following citation:

If Mr. Roosevelt is a man of knowledge and wisdom and walks according to them, there are some things in his conduct which I do not understand. A little over a year ago, he came out boldly and said those people are "narrow bigots" who refuse to vote for a man because he is a Roman Catholic. Had he learned from history what he should have learned, he would have known, as we have seen in these letters, that the Roman Catholic Church is opposed to the freedom of speech and the press, a non-sectarian school system, a separation of State and Church, and that every Catholic bishop takes an oath to support the pope in his claims, and that every Catholic must obey this bishop. He refused to learn from history what we say concerning the Romish Church. Now, by his own experience at the Vatican, he sees that the pope is opposed to religious toleration. Instead of plainly announcing to the world what his experience and judgment certainly tell him is the truth, he cables to America that the matter is a personal one between him and the pope, and that there should be no discussion of the matter. We may suppose that he said this in order to try to hold his popularity with the Catholic people. If Mr. Roosevelt has not learned from history and his own experience that the Roman Catholic Church is anti-American, then he is an unsafe man as a leader of a great people; and if he has learned that this church is anti-American, he should try to repair the mischief he has done, and should not try to hide his convictions, but should love his country enough to make them known and try to save this land from the hand of the religious despot; and he, furthermore, should apologize to those liberty-loving Americans whom he branded as "narrow bigots" because they will not vote for a servant of the anti-American head of an anti-American church.

The author winds up his argument in ch. 8 with the following words:

I do not think for a moment, Mr. Gibbons, that the intelligent people of America will forsake Protestantism for Catholicism while our means of education are untrammelled. The status of morality in the latter is too great a hindering cause. The only way you can convert America to your principles is through a censorship of the press and the corruptions of the politicians. That you are making great progress in suppressing facts which are detrimental to your church, and that you are corrupting politicians, all well-informed people know. While it is true that you do not probably hold one-third of the Catholics who come to our shores, still you hold enough to form a political machine which practically controls the politicians of our land. Those who will not cater to your wishes you turn down, and those who will help your church contrary to American principles you will exalt by your votes. These are the reasons I shall never knowingly vote for a Roman Catholic for president, or any other

office of importance in our government, and these are the reasons I shall teach my children to do the same thing after me.

Yours for American liberties, etc.

The price of this tract (20 cts., 3 for 50 cts.) should be reduced.

HOMILETISCHES REALLEXIKON NEBST INDEX RERUM. Von *E. Eckhardt*. H. Heft 15. Blair, Nebr. 1910.

This issue carries forward the cataloguing of sermonic material in the leading publications of the Synodical Conference, and the indexing of their contents, in general, from "Hades" to "Inspiration." Besides the terminal articles aforementioned it contains such titles as "Hausgottesdienst," "Heiligung," "Heuchelei," "Himmelfahrt," "Hoffnung," "Hohepriester," "Hoelle," a very rich collection on "Homiletik," and "Indifferentismus."

THE GRAND ARMY. Reprint of a Statement Printed in the Parish Paper of Bethlehem Congregation, St. Louis, Mo. June, 1910. *H. B. Hemmeter*, Pastor.

The Grand Army has had to be rebuked on previous occasions, and the rebuke was administered in a more extensive and elaborate form than in the present leaflet. But the present reply to its false claim is sufficient, and moreover, attacks the G. A. R. in a vital spot, its un-American mingling of Church and State. The leaflet is a terse and original production. Free upon request.

PROHIBITION VERSUS AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP, STATE, ECONOMY, MORALITY, AND RELIGION. By *W. Hallerberg*, Pastor. St. Louis, Mo. 1910.

The chapter divisions of this timely and ably written tract are indicated in the title. In the opening chapter on "The Prohibition Policy" the author reveals a sound motive for writing his tract, when he says:

Again, others will studiously avoid making the argument against Prohibition, because of the danger of creating the false impression that they had identified themselves with the liquor business and all the ills and vices that frequently attach themselves thereto. But these good people forget that when they hold a right position they have a duty to perform, a duty involving at times fundamental principles, in the present case the maintenance of personal rights, the preservation of liberty (both civil and religious), and the welfare of the State and Church; and so they must not refuse to perform their duty, even though a false impression be created with those who judge before they read, or will not listen to a fair argument.

The concluding chapter, "Prohibition versus Religion," is a lucid presentation of the chief element of danger in the Prohibition Movement.

LOGENBELIGION. Ein Vortrag, gehalten vor den ev.-luth. Gemeinden in St. Joseph, Mo., und auf deren Wunsch dem Druck uebergeben von *F. A. Mehl*. Price, 5 cts.

The congregation which ordered this excellent address on the false deity worshiped in the lodges and the false salvation propounded by them has honored itself as much as the author. An unusual amount of crushing evidence on the two charges indicated has been gathered on 32 pages. Besides the antichristian tenets of Masonry we find reviewed in this pamphlet those of the Odd-Fellows, Red-Men, Ancient Order of United Workmen, Knights of Pythias, United Order of Foresters, Elks, Eagles, Modern Woodmen of America. The tract offers *multum in parvo*. Our only regret is that its usefulness is limited to German readers.

PRAYERS. Submitted by *Martin S. Sommer*, Pastor of Grace Ev. Lutheran Church, St. Louis, Mo. Third Edition, Revised. Published by Rudolph Volkening, St. Louis, Mo. Price: Blue cloth, 25 cts.; gilt edge, 50 cts., plus 3 cts. postage.

This booklet is an old favorite in our circles. We are not surprised to see that a third edition was called for. It is one of the best mementos to put into the hands of the newly-confirmed.

LUTHERAN SUNDAY SCHOOL LEAFLET. Published weekly by Lutheran S. S. Leaflet Co., Sheboygan, Wis. *Rev. W. M. Czamanske*, Editor. *Rev. Ernst Ross* and *Rev. H. C. Steinhoff*, Assistant Editors. Official S. S. Paper of Northwestern English Conference.

The system adopted for these leaflets is that of the concentric lesson. The three grades of the average Sunday School, the Primary, the Junior, and the Senior, are taken through the same lesson, the material being expanded at each advance. The Catechism is used as the base of all instruction, but Bible History furnishes the greater part of the material for this *Leaflet*. The plan is very good and has been followed with good success elsewhere. The two Lessons submitted to us have been elaborated with great skill. The intellectual plane of the various grades is well kept in view throughout.—*Rev. Czamanske* has also published a second edition of "The Just Shall Live by Faith," a children's service for the festival of the Reformation, which deals with pre-Reformation and Reformation facts.

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XV.

APRIL, 1911.

No. 2.

WALTHER THE LUTHERAN.

"The Lutheran Church of this country mourns the departure of a spiritual father. . . . A very particular mission to the Lutheran Church of this century had been entrusted by God to this man"¹⁾ — pensively the eye rests on these simple, yet far-reaching statements, which suggest two splendid *Richtlinien* for reflection: Walther and the Lutheran Church of America; Walther and the Lutheran Church of the Nineteenth Century.

The words quoted were uttered on May 15, 1887, at Walther's bier, when the remains of the great American Lutheran were about to be transferred from Concordia Seminary, whose President and best-known professor he had been, to "old Trinity," the Lutheran mother-church of St. Louis, whose beloved *pastor primarius* he had been up to the hour of his death. The speaker, Walther's pastor, was a man not given to excessive praising or idolizing of men. The statements which he made regarding his famous parishioner were a sober estimate of Walther's worth, and they were spoken reverently and in the fear of God. In the same spirit we study these words, now that the centenary of Walther's birth is upon us, and seek to verify their scope and applicableness.

The Walther memorial of this year is to witness no hero-worship on the part of Missourians, no fulsome eulogies, no injudicious and unreflecting exaltation of human achieve-

1) *Lutheraner* 1887, p. 85.

ments. Missourians may think much of Walther personally, as a scholar, an author, an administrator, a friend. These are minor matters. But Walther's life and work can be viewed as a fact, a deed of divine Providence and Mercy. *As such* it deserves study. God *did* intend something particular when He raised up this man and guided him as He has done. It has been said by a non-Missourian that, in sending Walther, God took pity on the Lutheran Church of America.²⁾ Another writer, not a Missourian, sums up his estimate of Walther in these words: "From every part of the Lutheran Church in the Old World and the New his death elicited the testimony: A great one in Israel is fallen! . . . His was, indeed, an epoch-making personality, and from his activity mighty impulses radiated to Lutherans in all parts of the world. 'I bow my head to him in humility,' said the President of the General Lutheran Conference, Dr. Kliefoth, at the convention in Hamburg, in 1887."³⁾ — We have here exactly the same ideas as above, only differently worded: Walther's influence on the Lutheran Church of America, and of the Nineteenth Century. And this influence is dated back to God as the cause.

Whatever God accomplishes is to the child of God a matter of interest and an affair of moment, from which he draws wholesome lessons of enlightenment and comfort. Outside of what *God* achieved through Walther everything else is, at best, an interesting reminiscence, a gratefully cherished remembrance, but no more. These things will vanish, have already vanished to a great extent; the divine work for which Walther served as a tool will abide. It has become a historical fact. It has been worked into the texture and fabric of Lutheranism. Ingratitude may bury it in oblivion; bias may minimize its value; but it cannot be removed. It is there to stay. While God's Word and Luther's doctrine abide to rouse Lutheran consciousness and to quicken the Lutheran

2) Dr. Kummer in PRE2, vol. 18, p. 695, quoting the General Council publication *Pilger durch Welt und Kirche*, vol. 5, p. 370.

3) Dr. Spaeth in PRE3, vol. 20, p. 848.

conscience, the work of Walther will again and again assert its value and exert its power. Since, let us say, 1844, the year when *Der Lutheraner* began to be published, it is simply impossible to write a true history of Lutheranism without taking into account the mighty influences that emanated from Walther.

At the time when Walther began his public career as an expounder of Lutheranism, Dr. Schmucker was the acknowledged oracle of the Lutheran Church in America. His "Elementary Course of Biblical Theology, translated from the work of Professors Storr and Flatt" appeared in its second edition in 1836; and his "Elements of Popular Theology; with occasional references to the Doctrines of the Reformation, as avowed before the Diet at Augsburg in MDXXX" was running in its sixth edition in 1848. "Portraiture of Lutheranism," by the same author, was "a discourse delivered by request at the consecration of the First English Lutheran Church, Pittsburgh, October 4, 1840, during the session of the Synod of West Pennsylvania, and published by resolution of said body." This discourse with a number of others, was expanded into "The American Lutheran Church, Historically, Doctrinally, and Practically Delineated," which came out in its sixth edition in 1853. A few selections from these writings will lead us to understand what a shock American Lutheranism received, when Walther's voice rang out in the land,—and how necessary it was that American Lutheranism should receive just such a shock.

"The Lutheran Church, in the United States, . . . has indeed always regarded the Augsburg Confession as the authorized summary of her doctrines, but has not required any oath of obligation to all its contents. The General Synod of the Lutheran Church has adopted only the 21 doctrinal articles, omitting even the condemnatory clauses of these, and also the entire Catalogue of Abuses corrected. No minister, however, considers himself bound to believe every sentiment contained

in these twenty-one articles, but only the fundamental doctrines. Accordingly, the pledge of adoption required at licensure and ordination is couched in the following terms:

"1. Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, and the *only infallible* rule of faith and practice?

"2. Do you believe that the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God are taught, in a manner *substantially* correct, in the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession?

"The Lutheran divines of this country are not willing to bind either themselves or others to anything more than the fundamental doctrines of the Christian revelation, believing that an immense mass of evil has resulted to the Church of God from the rigid requisition of extensive and detailed creeds. The Savior and His apostles have left no other creed than that contained in the Scriptures, and although experience and the nature of the case require some mutual agreement as to the doctrines to be inculcated by the ministry in any portion of the Church of Christ, lest one should demolish what the other is laboring to build up, yet we can see no sufficient warrant for any Christian Church to require as a term of admission or communion greater conformity of view than is requisite to harmony of feeling and successful cooperation, in extending the kingdom of Christ.

"What unshackled friend of truth can doubt that the introduction of so many minor ramifications of doctrine into Modern Confessions of faith, and the requisition of them all as terms of ecclesiastical admission and communion, destroyed the natural estimate which every unbiased mind would form of the relative importance of each? Who can doubt that men were thus led to regard and denounce as heretics the members of other communions, who held as cordially as they themselves did, all the essentials of the Christian system, and in the eyes of the great Head of the Church were perhaps more acceptable than their self-erected judges? In short, it cannot be denied that the enormous amplitude of the Protestant Symbols, and

the unqualified assent to them, which was for a long time required in all the churches, and is even now demanded in some, were and ever would be a bone of endless contention, and the prolific mother of *bigotry* and *sectarianism*. Had the early Protestants endeavored to select the principal and fundamental doctrines of Christianity, required a belief of them from all applicants for admission into their ranks, and agreed among themselves that discrepancy of views on matters of non-fundamental nature should neither be a bar to ecclesiastical communion nor fraternal affection, they would have saved the Church from the curse of those dissensions by which piety was in a degree destroyed, and, on several occasions, the very foundations of Protestantism shaken. What can be more painful to the true Christian than to witness those who love the Lord Jesus wasting their strength in mutual crimination for departure from some jot or tittle of a creed, not involving the grand scheme of Gospel truth, nor clearly determined in Scripture, which ought to be directed against the enemies of the cross, which ought to be expended in bringing sinners to Christ?

"But although the Lutheran divines are strenuous advocates for liberty of thought and free, untrammelled investigation of God's Word, there is really as much doctrinal agreement and more harmony of feeling among them than is found in any other church in America. Indeed, we do not hesitate to record it as our deliberate opinion that full latitude of investigation within the bounds of fundamentals is better calculated to beget unity of faith than extensive symbolic restrictions. How can that man be an impartial inquirer after truth, how can he throw open his soul to the full influences of evidence, who knows that exclusion from his ecclesiastical connections, ejection from his pastoral charge, and the exposure of his dependent family to poverty and want, would be the consequence, if his investigations should result in the rejection of a single article in his confession of faith?"⁴⁾

4) *Popular Theology*, pp. 49 ff.

The above remarks are from a work, "explanatory of the doctrines of the Lutheran Church, and undertaken by request of the General Synod of said Church." It was "designed chiefly for private Christians and theological students." Hence, this work comes backed with the authority of the leading Lutheran organization of the country, and it has a formative mission: its aim is to raise the Lutheran *comme il faut*, a suave, urbane, "Christian" gentleman, who says to you: "Brother, we agree to disagree. What profit is there to either of us in quarreling over non-essentials? We condemn no one, except persons who will trammel our thought and refuse to pay us our perquisites. It is a pity those old confessional standards were ever raised. If we have Christ and the apostles on our side, is not that sufficient?"

We are naturally desirous to ascertain what a Lutheran of this *genus* has learned from Christ and His apostles.—On the inspiration of the sacred writers the same author expresses himself as follows: "Matt. 13, 52; 10, 27. There certainly were instances in which the apostles were to speak without any preparation, Luke 21, 14, and in which their superior helper, who promised to supply the want of preparation, must necessarily do more than merely inspire them with intrepidity and presence of mind; since otherwise they could not dispense with previous reflection, so necessary to give value and effect to their communications. . . . But if special aid was given whenever it was necessary, it follows that when it was not given, it would have been superfluous; and, therefore, that when the apostles were left to the use of their own powers, their instructions were no less conformable to the will of their divine Instructor than when they were directed by His special aid. . . . The apostles doubtless thought for themselves, that is, exercised their natural faculties, and communicated their own thoughts, both in their oral and written instructions. . . . As far as the credibility of the apostolical instruction is concerned, it is a matter of perfect indifference whether we believe that the Spirit of God sug-

gested the very words in which those instructions were uttered or written, or whether the Spirit only guided and aided them, from time to time, so far as necessary. The former supposition, however, does not seem to comport with the diversity of style and arrangement in the apostolical writings.”⁵⁾—“That nothing may be advanced to which the most anxious and scrutinizing examination of Christianity can attach the least shadow of doubt, I shall seldom rely, exclusively, on proofs derived from the antilegomena of the New Testament; or on the authority of those books of the Old Testament which are not explicitly quoted in the New, as divine; or on books, the authority of which depends not merely on their historical credibility, but also on the divine authority of Mark and Luke.”⁶⁾

That there is considerable rationalistic leaven in this exhibition of the formal principle of the Reformation goes without saying. The material principle fares little better. The imputation of Adam’s guilt to his posterity and the damnable-ness of man’s natural condition under sin, the atonement of Christ, by which the sinner world has been reconciled to God, prior to any person’s faith in the vicarious work of Christ, the doctrine of salvation by faith, exclusive of any human merit, are presented on the ground of copious and pertinent Scripture texts. Notwithstanding this, the author has no scruple in saying: “All this (the blessings of salvation) is suspended on the condition that we believe the doctrine concerning the salvation.” The author acknowledges that faith “is by no means the meritorious cause of our salvation. . . . Nor has this confidence in the Redeemer so high an intrinsic value as to entitle us to the great salvation which is promised to believers, as a merited reward. Faith is not really a virtue or righteousness, by which we become worthy of so great a salvation; . . . faith in the promises of God presupposes the truth of those promises, and does not create it by first believing it.” Nevertheless he insists that “the condition of sal-

5) *Biblical Theology*, p. 127 f. 144 f.

6) *Ibid.*, p. 177.

vation is, that we should believe; he urges the force of "if" in Rom. 10, 9, of ἐπὶ πίστει in Gal. 2, 16, and paraphrases Gal. 3, 11: "He who is justified on account of his faith" (in the unmerited pardon of God) "shall be saved."⁷—His views of the relation of faith to predestination are on the same line. "For those, concerning whom He foresaw that they would belong to His people, He appointed a glory, etc. . . . We shall know, when the event arrives, what God foresaw concerning us; and until then it is enough for us to know, and of this we may be fully convinced, that it is the most sincere and earnest will of God actually to bestow the offered salvation on all those who are called; and on the other hand, that it is necessary for us to use our utmost and untiring exertions to accomplish this earnest will of God, in the attainment of which He Himself cooperates in the most active manner (2 Pet. 1, 3); and that our exertions must be continued even after we have attained a distinguished grade among the pious (ἐκλεκτοί in the more specific sense), and have made progress in the path of holiness. If we have not this conviction, we shall be in danger of being discouraged, or of falling into doubts as to our salvation, or of being indolent or indifferent, and thus, perhaps, not perform the condition on which our salvation is suspended. If we do submit to the condition on which alone God is willing to save us, and persevere unto the end, it will appear that God foresaw that we should continue in the faith and attain the promised salvation." And so as to leave no doubt that he holds the *intuitu fidei finalis*-view of predestination, the author adds: "But the reason why we fulfill or neglect to fulfill the condition appointed by God is not *because* God foresaw that we would do so."⁸

In Sec. 69 the author defends the thesis: "Faithful obedience to the dictates of conscience is, in adults, the condition of participation in the salvation purchased by Christ;" in Sec. 72 the thesis: "The salvation of those to whom a

7) Ibid., pp. 565 ff.

8) Ibid., pp. 409. 411.

divine revelation was given, is suspended on their faithfulness in the use of it."⁹)

The origin of faith is veiled in much obscurity in the author's account of Biblical teaching. Neither in what he says on the subject of the call, nor of repentance, nor on the influences of divine grace do we find a clear, unqualified statement that faith, as Luther says, "is a divine work in us." It is plainly synergistic teaching when the author (p. 559) says: "Nor are those religious feelings which by the divine aid are excited and cherished within us for the purpose of assisting us in our conflict with the sinful propensities of our nature, either independent of our knowledge of divine truth, or contrary to the principles of our moral nature. On the contrary, they are in perfect accordance with our religious knowledge, and are in one respect within the power of man; he can cherish and obey them, and act in conformity to those views of religious truth (Matt. 13, 23. 19) with which they are connected (Rom. 8, 4. 13), or by a different course of conduct he can neglect and suppress them." In a Lutheran compend of Biblical Theology it is certainly startling to find the following: "It is not an objectionable phraseology to say that our salvation is bestowed on man in consequence of his change of mind and reformation of life, or, that it is the reward of his reformation." The virus is not extracted from this un-Lutheran and un-Christian statement by the sentence which follows: "But faith, and the reformation of life necessarily connected with it, which is certainly the condition on which an undeserved salvation is graciously bestowed on man, must by no means be regarded as the meritorious cause of this salvation."¹⁰) To preach salvation by grace thus is simply to render every genuine conception of grace chimerical and ridiculous.

One is led to question whether the author is really in earnest in teaching a necessity of faith in Christ, when reading the following: "Those who lived before Christ (or since

9) Ibid., pp. 395. 402.

10) Ibid., p. 588 f.

that time), and yet knew nothing of a Redeemer, will doubtless partake of that salvation purchased for every individual of the human family, if they have only cherished a faith in God as far as their circumstances rendered it possible, and acted in obedience to the dictates of this faith. Nor will the fact that they knew nothing of this atonement prevent its application to them." "That unbelief, *ἀπιστία*, which (according to John 3, 18. 36; Mark 16, 16) subjects its possessor to the sentence of damnation, is not even possible with those who have never heard the Gospel. John 15, 22; Rom. 10, 14. And those passages themselves presuppose in the unbeliever an acquaintance with the Gospel. Comp. John 3, 19. 32—34; Mark 16, 15; John 6, 40; 14, 21. . . . Rom. 8, 29, etc., does not exclude those who have not been called, from the hope of salvation. This remark, combined with Illustration X and §§ 69. 72, form a reply to the objection which has been urged to the Christian religion: 'that the ethical system of Jesus appears to degenerate into a narrow particularism (sectarianism), by teaching that we must first believe in Jesus Himself, in order to become truly reformed and acceptable to God and eternally happy.' And it likewise affords an answer to the question, 'What are the prospects of those who never had an opportunity to hear Jesus? Are they incapable of any virtue truly acceptable to God? And what is the situation of those who have indeed heard of Jesus, but have been unable, though sincere in their inquiries, to convince themselves of some of the doctrines which He taught, *e. g.*, relative to His person? Is faith in theoretical doctrines anything of a meritorious nature?"¹¹⁾ A view such as this is sufficiently broad to be mistaken, at least, for Universalism.

Strange, too, in a Lutheran, is what the author says in the chapter on "Influences of Grace." We meet here with the well-known distinction of enthusiasm. "The Scriptures clearly distinguish between the influence of the doctrines and the direct or immediate influence of God. 1 Cor. 3, 6. 7: 'I have planted,

11) *Ibid.*, pp. 395. 400.

Apollos watered, but God gave the increase,' etc. Here the divine influence (*ὁ θεὸς αὐξάνων*, God gave the increase) is distinguished from the labors of the preachers ('planting' and 'watering') and, consequently, from the doctrines themselves, and the influence of God on the preaching. Phil. 2, 12. 13: 'Labor at the salvation of others with modesty and respect for them' (?), *φóβω καὶ τρόμῳ*,—for their salvation is not the fruit of your labor alone; but God must also exert an influence on them before they are willing and able to obey the doctrines of the Gospel; it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do (accomplish). In 2 Thess. 2, 15—17, the agency of God and Christ is distinguished from the influence of the apostolical doctrines (vv. 16. 17), Eph. 3, 16, that He (the Father) would grant unto you according to the riches of His glory to be strengthened with might (powerfully strengthened) by His Spirit in the inner man. Even if this passage did not attribute the strengthening of the heart to the Spirit, in an immediate manner; if it described this effect merely as a mediate one, through the instrumentality of the Word, still it would clearly inculcate an influence distinct from the Word; for it contains a prayer to God, that He might co-operate with the Word (which was previously known), and render it effectual in confirming the heart. But a comparison of the 20th verse with ch. 1, 19 renders it probable that the words 'strengthened with might,' *δυνάμει χρισταωθῆναι*, refer to some internal influence of God, which internal influence produced faith in the Christians of those days (1, 19), and is still operative in the hearts of believers (3, 20), through the Holy Spirit. Rom. 8, 9. 11. 14. 16; 5, 5."¹²

In Sec. 105 the author defends the thesis: "The co-mixture of good and bad in the Church does not justify us in seceding from it." In the course of the discussion he approaches the question of the necessity of church discipline, and says: "Although it is impossible entirely to prevent the occurrence of snares (offenses, Luke 17, 1), they are to be

12) Ibid., p. 554 f.

avoided as much as possible, for Paul, when speaking of the incestuous person, tells us that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump (1 Cor. 5, 6); and Christ reproved the pastors or angels of the churches of Pergamus and Thyatira for tolerating certain seducers, Rev. 2, 6. 14. 20. Nevertheless, every individual Christian is to beware, lest he arrogate to himself an authority which belongs only to the Church and not to individuals, 1 Cor. 5, 2. 13. The incestuous person was condemned, not by an individual, but by the majority of the church members (who coincided with Paul in opinion); and Paul says (2 Cor. 2, 6): 'Sufficient unto such an one is the punishment which was inflicted by many.' Let no one make encroachments on the regulations of the church, but, 1 Cor. 14, 33, let all things be done decently and in order. (11, 16.) There are indeed certain measures which an individual may take, such as exhortation (1 Thess. 5, 14; 2 Thess. 3, 15) and shunning intercourse with unworthy members of the church (v. 14; 1 Cor. 5, 9—11); but those measures must not be taken in an irregular manner (Matt. 7, 6; Eph. 5, 16; comp. Col. 4, 5 and 6), or at an unseasonable time, or in such a way as shall interfere with the jurisdiction of the civil government. The civil government is now so intimately interwoven with the Church that we cannot judge everything by the standard of the ancient Christian Church, which had no connection with the government of the state, and therefore, could have more efficient internal regulations, without being in danger of interfering with civil liberty and rights. It is the duty of the Church to counteract all evils as far as possible, and, in short, to conduct all things as circumstances may dictate, so that their measures may not entail greater evils on the Church whose prosperity they were intended to subserve. Thus Paul advises the restoration of the incestuous person, because he feared that its procrastination might lead some to slander his character, by which means Satan would strive to alienate the affections of the people from him, and thereby from Christ. — In a future world, the Church

will attain the state for which she was intended, namely, that of entire purity and perfection." Witness also the author's great concern in behalf of errorists, in the following: "I admit, it is possible that those who depart from the public standard may have the more correct opinions, that, though they are considered to be in error, truth may be on their side (2 Cor. 6, 8) — I admit, that for this very reason it is the duty of those to whom the care of the Church is committed, and who are qualified for the investigation, impartially to weigh the truth and importance of the disputed doctrine, and if it be found true, to incorporate it with the acknowledged standard, or, if it seem doubtful which of the opposite opinions is more correct, to leave the adoption of either optional with the ministers of the Church."¹³ — Indifferentists and syncretists could easily find shelter under such views as these.

When a theologian holding views like those set forth above undertakes to "portray" Lutheranism, we would naturally expect to see a caricature. Such Dr. Schmucker has produced. We shall quote only one statement, which sufficiently characterizes the book and the man who did not blush to publish it under his official title, "First Professor in the Theological Seminary of the General Synod of the Lutheran Church, Gettysburg, Pa." Speaking of the "Progressive Development of the Lutheran Church," the author enumerates a number of "improvements." "The fifth item of improvement in the Lutheran Church is the more *systematic adjustment of her doctrines*. Luther was so incessantly employed in the great work of reforming the Church from the corruptions and superstitions of Rome that he had little leisure for abstract reflections on the reciprocal relations of the Scripture doctrines and on the entire and minute consistency of his views with each other. It is certain that in the earlier part of his life he believed the Augustinian view of predestination. His work, *On the Bondage of the Will*, published in 1525, must put this ques-

13) Ibid., pp. 500. 505.

tion to rest. But he, at the same time, entertained other views inconsistent with this. Melancthon, who had embraced Luther's unadjusted views of doctrine, led the way in the process of harmonizing their conflicting elements, by the rejection of absolute predestination. Luther himself adopted these modifications, and, long before he died, preached and taught what have ever since been the doctrines of the Lutheran standards. The particulars of this interesting process are detailed in Dr. Plank's invaluable 'History of the Rise, Changes, and Formation of the Protestant System of Doctrines.' During the reign of infidelity in Europe, when an unbaptized philosophy had desecrated the sanctuary of God, and so far effaced all lineaments and extinguished all attachment to genuine Protestant Christianity that even a Buonaparte could contemplate as a matter of state policy the reestablishment of the Romish religion over all Protestant Germany, the doctrines of great reformers were forsaken by many. But thanks be to God, the cause of truth is again prospering, orthodoxy is again preponderant in Germany; and in the Lutheran Church in this country the great doctrines of the Reformation are taught as universally as in any other denomination of Christians in our land." (This grateful reflection might seem a psychological riddle. We bear in mind that the author's view as to what are "the great doctrines of the Reformation" is altogether at variance with the view which the Lutheran Church entertains on this subject. In reality, Dr. Schmucker's expressions of grateful admiration are extremely pathetic. They show to what extent he had lost his Lutheran sensorium.)

"The sixth feature of improvement is the adoption of a more regular and rigid system of church government and discipline in this country. The union between Church and State has prevented the adoption of an independent and thoroughly Scriptural discipline in the Lutheran, as well as in all the other established churches of Europe. Kings and princes are not willing to be disciplined by humble ministers and elders. Accordingly, the systems of discipline in different provinces

and kingdoms are different, and generally very lax. In this country our General Synod has adopted and recommended a system which, it is believed, contains all the prescriptions of the Savior and His apostles, and all that appeared most valuable in the systems of the different other churches. The government and discipline of each individual church is essentially like that of our Presbyterian brethren. Our Synods, also, in the structure and powers, most resemble their presbyteries, having fewer formalities in their proceedings, and frequently couching their decisions in the form of recommendations. Our General Synod is wholly an advisory body, resembling the consociations of the Congregational churches in New England. In addition to these regular ecclesiastical bodies constituting our system of government, we have special conferences for the purpose of holding stated protracted meetings. These are subdivisions of synods, containing ordinarily from five to ten ministers each, who are annually to hold several protracted meetings within the bounds of their district. The chief object of these meetings is, to awaken and convert sinners, and to edify believers by close, practical preaching. This feature mainly resembles the quarterly meetings of our Methodist brethren, and presents to pious and zealous ministers, who are thirsting for the salvation of souls, the most direct opportunity they can desire to glorify God and advance His spiritual kingdom. Yet all these meetings are to be conducted, as the Scriptures enjoin, 'decently and in order.' This system of government is not yet adopted by all our synods; yet its general features, with perhaps a greater admixture of Congregationalism, substantially pervade those synods also which have not yet united with the General Synod." (Some time prior to writing the above the author had become "extensively known, beyond the bounds of his own church, both in America and England," by his "Fraternal Appeal" to the American churches on Christian union. So state D. Harbaugh and J. B. Butler, who wrote the preface to the edition from which we are quoting. On the 20th and 30th of March, 1854, a short

time after Dr. Schmucker's book had appeared in its sixth edition, Dr. Philip Schaff lectured at Berlin "before a select assembly of ladies and gentlemen, as part of the course of weekly lectures held there on various topics by Drs. Hofmann, Nitzsch, Stahl, Hengstenberg, Tholuck, Mueller, Schmieder, Ritter, and other distinguished scholars." Dr. Schaff's topic was: "America: A Sketch of the Political, Social, and Religious Character of the United States of North America." In the second lecture the lecturer spoke of the American churches. He related the following incident: "When the Reformed Dr. Nevin, in 1846, vindicated the Calvinistic doctrine of a real spiritual presence and a real participation by faith of the body and blood of Christ, that is, the life-power of His humanity, the editor of the *Lutheran Observer* attacked and ridiculed this view as Romanizing, superstitious, and senseless. Dr. Schmucker adopts the Puritanic, essentially Zuinglian theory prevalent in America, and in a special article on this subject rejects not only the substantial, but even the dynamic or virtual presence of the human nature of the Redeemer, declaring that 'there is no real or actual presence of the glorified human nature of the Savior, either substantial or influential, nor anything mysterious or supernatural in the Eucharist.' Anywhere in Germany this would not even be called Zuinglianism, much less Lutheranism, but the purest Rationalism of common sense. Even Bretschneider and Wegscheider leave as much as this of that holy mystery of faith, that center of the Christian worship. But in America the lowest and coldest views of the sacraments and the church are not seldom joined with orthodoxy," etc. In the same lecture the speaker administered to American Lutherans this rebuke, uttered in the presence of European Lutherans: "The Lutheran Church has an important calling in the New World. This it cannot fulfill by being unfaithful to its genius and history, and casting away its doctrinal and practical peculiarities." pp. 187 f. 194. *Sapienti sat!*) — We return to the "Portraiture." "The last item of improvement to which we shall refer

is the practice of the Lutheran Church in this country not to bind her ministers to the minutiae of any human creed. The Bible, and the belief that the *fundamental doctrines* of the Bible are taught in a manner substantially correct in the Augsburg Confession, is all that is required. On the one hand, we regard it as certain that, if we would be faithful to the injunction of our text, 'not to receive any who come to us bringing another doctrine,' an examination of applicants for admission among us is indispensable. Such an examination is virtually a requisition of their creed, that we may compare it with our own. Now, whether the articles to which we require their assent be few or many, be written or oral, they are a creed, and obviously its reduction to paper presents some material facilities in the examination. A written creed, therefore, seems necessary to the purity of the Church. On the other hand, history informs us that for several hundred years after the days of the apostles no other creed was used in the whole Church than that called the Apostles' Creed, because admitted by all to contain the principal doctrines taught by the apostles. This creed embodied only the cardinal doctrines of the Gospel, which all the so-called orthodox denominations of the present day do actually believe; and yet the assent to these few doctrines did for centuries after the apostolic age secure admission to any and every part of the Catholic, that is, the universal, Church on earth. By what authority, then, did the several Protestant denominations after the Reformation adopt creeds ten and, some of them, a hundred times as long as that used in the earlier ages, and require assent to these interminable instruments as a condition of admission to their churches? The Bible certainly enforces no such authority. But does the experience of three centuries prove their influence to be salutary? Have they not rather been the occasion of endless strife in all the churches adopting them? Have they not proved wedges of dissension to split asunder the body of Christ? It is a matter of historical certainty that the orthodox denominations of the present day coincide as much in

doctrinal views as did the Christians in the golden age of Christianity. If they could walk together in love, and their minor differences created no difficulties then, why should not Christians in the present day unite in the same manner, instead of rending the body of Christ asunder, creating separate and conflicting interests among brethren in Christ, alienation and prosecutions for minor differences, which would not have been noticed in the apostolic, and primitive, and purest age of the Church? The duty of all parts of the Christian Church seems therefore to be to return to the use of shorter doctrinal creeds as tests of ecclesiastical, ministerial, and sacramental communion. This noble course the Lutheran Church has already virtually taken, by requiring assent only to the fundamental doctrines of the Augsburg Confession, together with an approval of our principles of government and worship. This course cannot fail to promote brotherly love and fraternal appreciation between different denominations, by giving prominence to their actual unity in doctrine, and restoring a proper unity of spirit among the disciples of Christ. Happy, thrice happy, too, is the Lutheran Church, that she, who was first to cast off the yoke of Roman superstition and oppression, should lead the way in breaking the bonds of Protestant sectarianism; be first in practically teaching the world that the apostolic injunction to 'receive a brother that is weak in the faith, but not for the purpose of doubtful disputation,' does not mean to prosecute and expel him. And happy are all in every denomination who raise their voice in behalf of the lacerated body of Christ, and teach Christians to remember the solemn injunction of the Savior to love one another, and not only to profess, but to practice the principle of our blessed Lord, 'One is our Master, Christ, and ye are all brethren.'—Such, my brethren, are the features of the Lutheran Church, of that church to whose service this chaste and beautiful edifice has been dedicated," etc.¹⁴⁾

14) Portraiture of Lutheranism, in *The American Lutheran Church*, historically, doctrinally, and practically delineated. 6th ed., pp. 65 ff.

The man whose theological position we have sketched in his own words was, at the time of Walther's arrival, the leading instructor of Lutheran students of theology. He was in his day what Walther became later.¹⁵⁾ If the Lutheran Church in America ever was on the verge of ruin, it was when her fortunes were entrusted to Dr. Schmucker. Rationalism, synergism, enthusiasm, syncretism—all found a spokesman in him. There is a fine sarcasm in Dr. Schaff's remarks before his audience at Berlin, when, speaking of Dr. Schmucker, he says: "The leader of the Low-church American Lutheranism, though he has translated Storr's Dogmatic into an English abridgment, and has studied the Supranaturalistic literature of Germany, is, in his theology, properly altogether Anglo-American, partly after the Puritanic Presbyterian stamp, partly after the Methodist, which appears in his Pelagianizing views of the freedom of the will and his theory of conversion and regeneration; but he would feel highly insulted to be classed with the German Rationalists, since he holds the divinity of Christ, as well as the divine inspiration and authority of the Holy Scriptures (?), as fundamental articles of faith. He has also endeavored to show that almost all the leading men of the Lutheran Church of America had no higher views of the sacraments than himself, and that even in the old Pennsylvania Synod very few rose above the Zuinglian theory, which may certainly, till within a few years, (!) have been the case."¹⁶⁾ A Melancthonian, as regards doctrine and polity, a Plankian, as regards the history of Lutheran dogma, an ardent admirer of Mosheim and Reinhard—such was Dr. Schmucker, the genius of American Lutheranism about the middle of the nineteenth century, the unavowed author of the "Definite Platform," which purported to be the Augsburg Confession as understood by American Lutherans.

Night had lowered on the Church of the Reformation in America. Her children were weeping and wishing for the day to come. Editor Spielmann of the *Lutheran Standard* was

15) Dr. Spaeth in PRE3, 17, 664 f.

16) America, etc., p. 188.

bowing his head in shame at the disgrace of his church. He called upon his readers to put on sackcloth and ashes, and to beseech God to keep the Lutheran Church from utter dissolution.¹⁷⁾

Yes, it was high time that the Lord should "take pity on the Lutheran Church of America," and raise up the spokesman for her who would speak her true mind to her countrymen.

(*To be concluded.*)

THE RISE OF ANTICHRIST.

Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento,
Hæc tibi erunt artes. — *Aeneis*, VI, 852. 853.

(*Concluded.*)

Towards the end of 1299 a rumor spread through the Western world that every one visiting St. Peter's at Rome on the first day of the new century would thereby get full forgiveness of all his sins. Dante uses the vast crowds with gold that crowded Rome as an illustration of the great numbers he met in the Inferno. The Pope vainly searched the archives for any basis for the rumor. But a man 107 years old told the Pope his father had been to Rome hundred years before for the jubilee and its indulgence. Splendid! What more would you? Pope Boniface VIII, accordingly, issued a bull granting a plenary indulgence, which was to be repeated every hundredth year. Every Roman who for thirty days that year, and every pilgrim who for fifteen days, would visit the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul reverently, penitently, and with confession, should receive full remission of sins. "Not only full, but fuller, yea, the fullest forgiveness of all his sins."

A hundred years seemed a long time between such golden harvests, and so Pope Clement VI, in 1343, decreed a jubilee every fifty years. Even fifty is quite too long for some, and so Pope Urban VI, 1378—1389, reduced the time to thirty-three years, and Paul II to twenty-five.

17) *Lutheran Standard*, vol. 3, No. 52, quoted in *Der Lutheraner*, vol. 2, p. 56.

In 1296 Boniface VIII declared the Pope had supreme control over all church property in the world. (*Angl. Br.*, 245.)

On November 18, 1302, he issued the famous bull "Unam Sanctam," embodied in the Canon Law, in which he sums up the claims of the Pope to supremacy over the state, adding that the Church cannot have two heads, for otherwise she would be a "monster." "Feed my lambs," we hear once more. Jeremiah witnesses: "See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms." Paul testifies: "He that is spiritual judges all things; yet he himself is judged of no man." The theory of the two swords is spun out at length, and he closes with the statement of Aquinas: "We declare, say, define, and pronounce it to be necessary to salvation, that every human creature be subject to the Roman pontiff." (Emil Reich, *Sel. Doc.*; Wylie, 100; Gieseler; Krueger, 125; Janus, 254; Thompson.) This is the pinnacle of papal pretensions, expressed "ex cathedra."

In 1312 the Earl of Lincoln on his deathbed complained that "the Church of England, once honorable and free, is now, alas, enslaved by the oppressions of Rome." (*Angl. Br.*, 281.)

Pope John XXII, who died 1334, published a price list of dispensations for various crimes. The systematic compilation of this list dates from Alexander VI, 1654. (*Real-encyc.* I, 94.)

Pope Victor III, 1085—1087, paved the way for indulgences, and Alexander of Hales († 1245) furnished the material by his theory of a treasury of superfluous good works earned by Christ, Mary, and the saints.

Pope Clement VI, in 1343, sanctioned the new doctrine and reserved for the Pope the privilege of managing this new treasury. How did he manage it? From 1471 to 1820 no fewer than forty-seven impressions of the "Taxes of the Roman Chancery" were printed; here are a few items of this price list of sins:—

	£.	s.	d.
17. For simony, or fornication of priests.....	36	9	6
22. For keeping concubine	4	5	6
23. For murder by bishop, abbot, etc.....	50	12	6
34. For murder of father, mother, brother, wife.....	4	1	6

Gibbon says at the Pope's Jubilee "Two priests stood day and night with rakes in their hands to collect, without counting, the heaps of gold and silver that were poured upon the altars." (Preston, 300—309.)

Remember Tetzels and his bargain sale of indulgences! Some of the proceeds went to build St. Peter's at Rome, which cost about \$50,000,000.

The *Catholic Dictionary* says: "Down to the Middle Ages the faithful usually received the Eucharist under both kinds." Leo I, 440, and Gelasius, 490, expelled the Manichaeans from fellowship for receiving the bread only. The Council of Clermont, 1095, and Paschal II, 1118, condemned it as "a human and novel institution . . . departure from what Christ, the Master, ordained and did." Yet the Council of Constance, in 1415, forbade wine to communicants. (Dearden, 168.)

Boniface IX, who died 1404, knocked down vacant offices to the highest bidder, keeping the money of those who had offered less.

About the time of Martin V, 1417—1431, the representative at Rome of the Knights of the Teutonic Order wrote to his superior: "Dear Master, send me money, for at this court all friendship ceases when the cash is gone," and Canon Hemmerlin of Zurich complained that "Benefices were sold in Rome as publicly as pigs in the market." (Krueger, 130. 138.)

A man might be a cardinal at Rome, a bishop in Germany, an archbishop in England, something else in several other places. Of course, he could not live at all these places, but for his absence and yet taking the income he had to pay the Pope a yearly tax. (*Realencyc.* I, 95.)

While at Rome, Luther learned of one man who had twenty-two parishes, seven provostries, and forty-two prebends! (Hausrath's *Luther* I, 86.)

Leo X created 1200 new offices that brought him in 900,000 scudi, so that there were 2150 offices bringing him a yearly income of 320,000 scudi. (Schick, 271.)

Guicciardini, a high official of the Medicean Popes, describes in his *Ricordi* how a bishopric was bought in Rome

for a fixed sum, and this was the usual provision for the younger son of an aristocratic family. His relative, Rinieri Guicciardini, bought the See of Cortona of the Pope for 4000 ducats. (Janus, 365.)

The usual bulls for Cranmer's consecration, eleven in all, cost 6000 ducats, and the annates cost 10,000 more. (A. B., 332.)

At the beginning of the sixteenth century the See of Mainz became vacant three times in ten years. Each time the vacancy was filled 14,000 ducats had to be paid to Rome. When, in 1514, Albert of Brandenburg was confirmed as Archbishop of Mainz and Magdeburg, and Administrator of Halberstadt, an additional charge of 10,000 ducats was demanded for the holding, illegal in itself, of the last-mentioned office, together with the See of Mainz. Thus altogether about \$125,000 was demanded. Rome proposed to cede to him the sale, in his diocese, of the indulgences, in order to pay off the 29,000 florins he owed the Fuggers and to divide the net profits equally. (Krueger, 162.)

In 1439 the Council of Florence officially adopted the seven sacraments.

"Pontifex Maximus" was adopted by Paul III, 1464—1471.

"To thee is given all power in heaven and in earth," said the Lateran Council to Pope Leo X, who says: "We, with the approbation of the present holy council, do renew and approve that holy constitution"—the "Unam Sanctam" of Boniface VIII. And Baronius says: "There can be no doubt of it but that the civil principality is subject to the sacerdotal, and that God hath made the political government subject to the dominion of the spiritual church."

God hath made the Pope to be "prince over all nations, that he may pluck up, overthrow, disperse, destroy, plant, and rear. . . . We deprive the Queen" (Elizabeth of England) "of her pretended right to the kingdom, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever, and absolve all the nobles,

subjects, and people of the kingdom, and whoever else have sworn to her, from their oath, and all duty whatsoever in regard of dominion, fidelity, and obedience." So wrote Pope Pius V in his Bull against the English Queen.

History gives us a list of 64 emperors and kings deposed by the Popes. (Wylie, 101. 102.)

The 16th century saw the rise of the "Congregations"—committees of cardinals for various purposes. In 1542 the Congregation of the Inquisition was instituted. Paul V, 1605—1621, added the Congregation of the Index of Prohibited Books. In the 11th century Gregory VII began to send legates, direct representatives of the Pope. In the 16th century nuncios were introduced. Gregory XV, 1621—1623, organized the Congregation of the Propaganda. The first time a bishop called himself such "by the grace of the Roman Court" we find in 1520. (Schick, 116. 286.)

"Vicar of Christ" was formerly a title common to all bishops, and its modern limitation to the Roman Pope was protested even in the Council of Trent. (Lit., P. C., 205.)

Up to the suppression of the smaller Religious Houses, in 1536, over 1200 monasteries had been built in England, of which about 150 paid subsidies to their parental houses in France or Italy amounting to \$300,000 yearly between 1327 and 1377. All these Houses regarded the will of the Pope as supreme over King, Church, and State. They were papal forts dotting the kingdom. (*Angl. Br.*, 249.)

The Spanish Cardinal Pacheco regretted that only few Fathers were present at Trent (180 at best), and then often absent from the council. Even the Jesuit Cardinal Pallavicino is forced to confess in numberless passages of his History that the Popes, either directly or through the legates, emperors, and princes, brought pressure to bear on the Fathers of the Council. Even Cardinal Borromeo, the Pope's nephew and secretary, admonished the three legates not to expect everything from Rome, lest the Fathers should have reason to believe that not they, but the Pope alone, was the council. Bishop Martelli of

Fiesole rose to say, with great force: "Not only were they not allowed freely to manifest their opinions and decisions, but, while discussing, they were shut up in private meetings, as if in so many jails." Those who spoke freely were styled "heretics, ill-bred, fools, rascals," and worse, according to the *Diary* of Angelo Massarelli, secretary of the council. The French Ambassador Lansac said the Holy Ghost arrived from Rome at Trent in the mail of the legates. (Bartoli, 236—265.)

The Council of Trent confirmed the teaching of the scholastics as to penance. Trent also made marriage a sacrament, though Durandus, Peraldus, Jacobus a Vitriaco in the previous century, and even Erasmus opposed it.

For 1200 years the form of absolution was that of a prayer, as in the Greek Church; but the Council of Trent defines it as "a *judicial* act, by which the priest as judge passes sentence on the penitent." (Dearden, 120.)

St. Bernard wrote: "Thou art as strong to justify as Thou art to pardon. Wherefore whosoever, smitten with compunction for his sins, hungers and thirsts after righteousness, let him believe on Thee who justifiest the ungodly: and being justified by faith alone, he will have peace with God." (Swete's *England v. Rome*, quoted in Dearden, 185.)—Yet Trent condemned and cursed justification by faith alone.

At Trent, in 1545, none of the thirty bishops knew Hebrew, few Greek; yet they canonized the Apocrypha. They also placed tradition on a level with the Bible, and Abbé Migne's "The Catholic Tradition" amounts to 220 thick volumes! When they spoke of depriving the Pope of the right of placing bishops, Julius III, 1550—1555, cried out, "None of that; rather shall the world go to ruin!" (Hase I, 198.)

The decrees of Trent were the first to be published against the will of the Emperor and, after publication, to lack the confirmation of the Emperor and the empire. (Schick, 171.)

King Henry II of France denied it was a General Council, and called it a "convention." (Dearden, 82.)

Though Trent decreed, in the 5th chapter of the 24th session, that the Pope is to grant dispensations rarely and without a fee in matrimonial matters, the Pope, in the year 1768, granted 580 such dispensations—for 1,050,000 francs.

According to a report made to the Republic of Venice the following sums went out of that little country to Rome in ten years:—

1. 28 bulls for bishops, etc.....	5,000,000 francs.
2. 42 bulls for abbey, etc.....	50,000 “
3. 110 bulls for pensions.....	78,000 “
4. 225 bulls for parishes.....	130,000 “
5. 127 bulls for collegiate churches.....	80,000 “
6. 45 bulls for transfers.....	12,000 “
7. 1130 indulgences, etc.....	44,500 “

(Schick, 90.)

Pope Paul IV declared the Inquisition to be the one support of the papacy in Italy. In 1558 he issued his Bull “Cum ex apostolatus officio” “Out of the plenitude of his apostolic power:” 1. The Pope, who as “Pontifex Maximus” is God’s representative on earth, has full authority and power over nations and kingdoms; he judges all, and can in this world be judged by none. 2. All princes and monarchs, as well as bishops, as soon as they fall into heresy or schism, without the need of any legal formality, are irrevocably deposed . . . and incur sentence of death. In case of repentance, they are to be imprisoned in a monastery, and to do penance on bread and water for the remainder of their life. 3. None may venture to give any aid to an heretical or schismatical prince, not even the mere services of common humanity. Any monarch who does so forfeits his dominions and property, which lapse to princes obedient to the Pope, on their gaining possession of them.

This horrible bull, which Cardinal Manning attributes to the direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost, is a deliberate and official sanction of the murder of all princes who may deny the faith and the jurisdiction of the See of Rome.

Cardinal Bellarmine writes: “The first opinion is, that the Pope has a most full power, *jure divino*, over the whole

world, in both ecclesiastical and civil affairs. The second opinion is, that the Pope's *immediate* and *direct* jurisdiction extends to ecclesiastical matters only, but that he possesses a *mediate* and *indirect* authority over temporal affairs also. This *indirect* temporal power is supreme and enables the Pope, for the welfare of the Church, to annul laws and depose sovereigns. Count de Maistre, Abbé Gosselin, and Cardinal Wiseman say, as the third opinion, that the Pope has the *direction* of the conscience of every Catholic. (Wylie, 109—111.) But what is the difference between a *director* and a *dictator*?

Sixtus V, 1585—1590, thought it high treason for Bel-larmine to twist the universal dominion of the papacy, set forth by Pius V, into the view that spiritual power alone belonged directly and immediately to the Pope as Pope, while temporal power, though of the most exalted kind, only belonged to him indirectly, just because of his spiritual power. He did not see that it was only a question of an extraordinarily skillful maneuver which led to the same goal by a roundabout road without contradicting too flatly the modern conception of the State, and that in practice no Jesuit would ever think of distinguishing between "direct" and "indirect." (Krueger, 194.)

Pope Urban, in 1627, in his Bull "In Coena Domini," excommunicates and curses all heretics and schismatics, as well as all who favor or defend them—all princes and magistrates, therefore, who allow heterodox persons to live in their country. It excommunicates and curses all who keep or print the books of heretics without papal permission, all—whether private individuals or universities, or other corporations—who appeal from a papal decree to a future General Council. (Janus, 385.)

"Let him alone, and let him curse! It may be that the Lord will look upon our affliction, and that the Lord will requite us good for his cursing this day," 2 Sam. 16, 11. 12.

There was a festival of the Virgin Mary as early as 430. The Annunciation is first alluded to as a festival in a canon of the Council of Toledo, about 656.

When Palestine fell into the hands of infidels, and worshippers could no longer resort to the house of the Virgin Mary at Nazareth, angels carried it across the seas on May 9, 1291; after taking three temporary resting-places, it finally settled down at Loretto, in 1295, where it drew many pilgrims and gifts. Several Popes pledged their credit to the truth of the story, and rewarded pious visitors with indulgences. To doubt the story is to deny the power and providence of God. The Protestant Ffoulkes investigated the story at Loretto and Nazareth and was convinced that it was a fraud despite the Popes. On stating his convictions to the French priest, who received Mr. Ffoulkes from the Episcopal Church into the Roman communion, the only reply was, "There are many things in the Breviary which I do not believe myself." (Salmon, *Inf.*, 197.)

When a priest of Naples took home some bones from the Roman catacombs and was distressed that his precious relics were nameless, a nun of his church had revealed to her in a dream the name and whole story of the saint, Philumena, who now outdoes the oldest one in the calendar in number of miracles she performs. This romance is circulated as truth, with the approval of the highest authorities—Pope Leo XII sanctioned her devotion and proclaimed the great saint, and Pope Gregory XVI blessed one of her images. (Salmon, *Inf.*, 198.)

At La Salette, near Grenoble, on September 19, 1846, two children minding cows on a lonely mountain saw a fine lady robed in yellow dress, who said she was the Virgin Mary. The matter became known, pilgrims crowded to the place, chapels arose, hotels were opened, medals were struck, the wonderful water was sold, for it cured disease and converted sinners.

Cardinal Newman's friend and diocesan, Bishop Ullathorne of Birmingham, published an account of his visit, professing full belief in the reality of the miracle. He opened, at Stratford-on-Avon, a chapel to Our Lady of La Salette,

and introduced the Confraternity of La Salette into his diocese. By a Brief of August 26, 1852, the Pope gave a plenary indulgence to visitors to La Salette, besides other privileges. Ullathorne's priest, Wyse, writes: "In matters of faith God loves a cheerful giver. He is not pleased with those who seek what is the very minimum of belief which will secure their salvation. In these days of infidelity, supernatural faith, cultivated for safety's sake to the very utmost, is the only security against the vilest errors."

Other Catholics declared the whole thing a fraud, that the "Virgin Mary" was one Constance Lamerlière, a nun, half knave, half crazy. She was forced to bring an action for defamation of character; the court decided against her; on appeal the decision was confirmed.

On February 11, 1858, at Lourdes, in Gascony, while picking up dry wood, Bernadette Soubirous, a poor girl of fourteen, saw a beautiful lady in white with a blue sash, who said, "I am the Immaculate Conception," and invited the girl to drink at a fountain. Seeing no fountain, the girl scraped away some earth with her hands, and water came out which now supplies millions of bottles for effecting wonderful cures. The bishop sanctioned the miracle, and pilgrims crowded thither. The miracles worked by the prayers of Our Lady of Lourdes ought to banish all doubts.

Shortly after the pilgrimages to Lourdes, others were organized to Paray-le-Monial, where Marguerite Marie Alacoque, at the end of the seventeenth century, saw, for instance, our Lord's heart in His bosom burning as in a furnace, and her own heart placed as a small atom of fire in that furnace. Pope Pius IX beatified her and sanctioned the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, now so very popular.

John Wiclif wrote: "The monk is a corpse risen from the grave, who, covered with graveclothes, is set by the devil to rove about in the world." The proverb runs, "What the devil shrinks from doing, a monk does without shrinking." Another, "What the devil cannot accomplish, he hires a Jesuit to do." (Hase II, 51. 84.)

The Lateran Council of 1215 compelled auricular confession of all sins at least once a year; Trent enjoins confession of mortal sins, but venial sins may be passed over in silence without any fault. Liguori sanctions the proposition that a Christian does not sin very grievously who proposes to commit every one of the venial sins. (Bain, *Devel.*, 147.)

Escobar teaches, that if men only direct aright their intention, that is, if they think not of the sin, but of the benefit flowing from it, there is nothing which they may not do with impunity. (Wylie, 457.)

You need not do what your conscience tells you is "safe" and right, if you can give any "grave" theologian's opinion to the contrary; you then follow a "probable" opinion. This is the Roman doctrine of Probability, or "Probabilism." It exists in germ in Thomas Aquinas, praised by Leo XIII and Pius X; it was developed and exploited by the Jesuits in the 17th century and exposed by Pascal's "Provincial Letters;" it is taught in the "Moral Theology" of Liguori, who died in 1787, ninety-one years old, who was made a "Doctor of the Church" by Pius IX in 1871. (Bain, *Devel.*, 142.)

The Jesuit Busenbaum says: "When the end is lawful, the means also are lawful." "He to whom the end is lawful, to him the means also are lawful." The Jesuit Layman says: "To whom the end is permitted, the means adapted to that end are permitted also." The Jesuit Wagemann says: "The end determines the rectitude of the act." (Littledale, *P. R.*, 208.)

Of the seminaries, especially of those established by Parsons in Spain, Cardinal d' Ossat wrote: "The object of these institutions is to instil into the minds of the missionaries the Spanish political creed; and for that, rather than the Catholic faith, were they, if necessary, to suffer martyrdom." (The Jesuit Taunton: *Hist. Jesuits in Engl.*, 134; Galton, 82.)

The famous Père La Chaise, writing to Father Petre in 1688, says that Aquaviva, the General of the Jesuits, allowed Parsons to support the claims of King Philip; and another agent, Creighton, to support the succession of King James VI,

"so that the Society should be on the winning side, whether James or Philip won." (Galton, 78.)

Innocent XI condemned mental reservation, or restriction in all cases, and yet Liguori permits "non-pure" for a just cause. (Bain, *Devel.*, 150.) Innocent XI set himself against the ethics of most Jesuit schools. (Lord Acton in *London Times*, Nov. 24, 1874.)

The Dominican Melchior Canus of Salamanca calls the Jesuits the "forerunners of Antichrist." Paolo Sarpi, the learned Servite monk of Florence, said in 1611: "When the Jesuits are destroyed, Rome will go down, and when Rome is lost, religion will renew itself." (Schick, 249. 250.)

Paul IV doubted even the orthodoxy of Loyola—whose extravagant mysticism for a time rendered him suspect to the Inquisition—and as a politician he did not trust him the width of the road. He even withdrew pecuniary support from the order and thereby placed Ignatius in great difficulties. (Krueger, 184.)

Sixtus V was inspired by the right feeling when he found himself unable to conquer his dislike for the order. (Krueger, 197.)

In 1759 the King of Portugal "issued a decree of banishment against the Jesuits as traitors, rebels, enemies to, and aggressors on, his person, his states, and the public peace and the general good of the people." One of the Jesuit plotters was burned alive by the Dominicans, and the other two were condemned to imprisonment for life. (The Roman Catholic Cermenin, in *History of the Popes* II, 392; in Thompson's *Footsteps of the Jesuits*, 218.)

King Charles III expelled the Jesuits from Spain. Parma, Naples, Milan, and Venice followed suit.

The Parliament of Paris appointed a commission of five Princes of the Blood, four Peers of France, seven Presidents of Courts of Justice, thirteen Councillors, and fourteen other officials to examine the works of no less than 147 Jesuit writers, and this committee found the Jesuits guilty of "authorizing

Theft, Lying, Perjury, Impurity, all Passions and all Crimes; of teaching Homicide, Parricide, and Regicide, and of substituting Superstition for Religion by favoring Magic, Blasphemy, Irreligion, and Idolatry."

By the edicts of April and August, 1762, with the consent of the King, the Parliament closed the Jesuit colleges, confiscated their property, and expelled them, about four thousand, from France, and declared their order inadmissible in any civilized state.

When Louis XV tried to get a reform of the Jesuits from their general, Ricci replied, "Sint ut sunt, aut non sint."

The Jesuits were banished to the Pope's lands—"the soil of Italy was polluted by this unclean slime which the nations had rejected, and which they had sent back to Rome, the fountain of all corruptions," writes the Romanist Cermenin. (Thompson, *Footsteps*, 222.)

Pope Clement XIII tried to protect them, but complained in powerless wrath, "The Vicar of Christ was treated like the lowest of mortals." (Krueger, 208.)

When he promised the sovereigns that "he would pronounce the abolition of the society in a public consistory," the night before the day appointed the Pope suddenly died. "The Jesuits had poisoned him," is the terse word of the Catholic Cermenin. (Thompson, *Footsteps*, 224.)

Pope Clement XIV, after long hesitation, at length, on July 21, 1773, issued the Bull "Dominus ac Redemptor noster," by which he suppressed the order in all parts of the world. The Pope says in the Bull that all attempts to reform the order had failed, and that its total suppression was needful for the peace and prosperity of the Church. The bull forbids under severe penalties that it should "ever be rescinded, glossed, or its meaning modified or explained away."

Pope Clement XIV struck a medal in honor of the dissolution of the Jesuits. On the face is a picture of the Pope with the words, "Clemens XIV. Pontif. Max.;" the reverse shows Christ, followed by Peter and Paul, driving forth three

Jesuit priests, with the legend, "I never knew you; depart from me, all of you!"

Clement said to a friend: "At last the suppression is accomplished. . . . I do not regret it, and were it not already done, I would do it now. *Ma questa suppressione mi sara la morte* (But this suppression will be my death)."

It was whispered the Pope would not live out the year. He died on September 22, 1774, after terrible sufferings and in the most horrible condition. The Romans all said, "The Jesuits have done this." (*Our Brief*, 246—248.)

A post mortem examination of his body revealed the presence of poison, as was reported to his Government by the Spanish ambassador, then at Rome. (Thompson, *Footsteps*, 228.)

Pius V, 1566—1572, could not be elected till he had reassured the Bourbon courts on the Jesuit question. (Krueger, 210.)

Only forty years after, in May, 1814, on his return to Rome, Pope Pius VII, by his Bull "Sollicitudo Omnium," reversed the bull of Pope Gregory XIV and restored the Jesuits.

The Roman Catholic Frenchman Lamennais said, "The Jesuits were *grenadiers de la folie*, and united imbecility with the vilest passions." (Lord Acton, *Essays on Liberty*, 464.)

Doellinger speaks of the ever-gaping wound in the reputation of the Jesuits—its moral system. (Janus, 36.)

"Jesuitism is but esoteric Catholicism made tangible." (Miss Caldwell, Baroness von Zedwitz, *The Double Doctrine of the Church of Rome*, 33. Revell.)

The Jesuits are what Gladstone calls the "Veiled prophets behind the papal throne, by whom the Latin Church is governed. These are the men who cherish, methodize, transmit, and exaggerate all the dangerous traditions of the Curia. They seem to supply that Roman malaria which Dr. Newman tells us encircles the rock of St. Peter."

To this "insolent and aggressive faction," as Cardinal Newman calls them, the Pope is mainly indebted for his infallibility in 1870.

Pope Pius IX, on December 8, 1854, solemnly proclaimed the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary. The Jesuit Schrader rightly says: "The independent definition of a dogma includes at the same time, not indeed explicitly and formally, but none the less undoubtedly and positively, another dogmatic decision, *viz.*, that of the disputed question whether the Pope is in his own person infallible in matters of faith, or whether he can claim this infallibility only at the head of a council." (Krueger, 237.)

At Whitsuntide, 1862, Pius IX assembled his cardinals and hundreds of bishops and canonized the twenty-six martyrs who perished in the persecution of Japan in 1597, and hoped thereby to gain new intercessors with God.

In March, 1864, the Pope addressed a brief to the Archbishop of Munich, in which he declared that the opinions of Catholic writers were subject to the authority of the Roman congregations.

On December 8, 1864, the Pope issued his "Quanta Cura" with the syllabus of eighty condemned propositions.

In the Bull "Aeterni Patris Unigenitus," Pius IX called the Vatican Council. Of the 750 Fathers the non-Italians did not number 300, whereas the 450 others were either Italians or dependent directly on the Pope for their living or on the *Propaganda Fide*. Pius IX, moreover, gave free lodging to some 180 poor Fathers, who repaid his hospitality by shouting for the infallibility. Dupanloup wrote or inspired the pamphlet "La Situation des Choses à Rome," proving that the Pope tyrannized the council, which, against the protest of almost all learned Catholics, voted to declare the Pope infallible.

In the Constitution "Pastor Aeternus" Pius IX decreed his personal infallibility, on July 18, 1870, and thereby declared that no Pope had ever erred.

The Romanist Thomas Canon Pope pp. 11—15 of his "Council of the Vatican" insists that the Church has the right to intrude "into the social relations of the general community

of worldlings," and has also the right to supervise the lectures of the professor, the diplomacy of the statesman, the government of kings, and to scrutinize their morality and punish their faults. (Thompson, *Footsteps*, 430—432.)

Hadrian II, in an allocution to the Roman Synod, in 869, says: "We read that the Roman Pontiff has pronounced judgments on the prelates of all the churches; we do not read that anybody has pronounced sentence on him."

Nicholas, to Emperor Michael, says: "It is evident that the judgment of the Apostolic See, than which there is no authority greater, may be rejected by no one, nor is it lawful for any one to pass judgment on its judgment." These sentiments of former Popes are quoted with approval by Pope Leo XIII in his encyclicals, p. 387.

The present Pope, Pius X, upholds the old claims of the papacy, as is proved in the recent Fairbanks-Roosevelt-Vatican affair.

It cost over 100,000 florins to pronounce Loyola a saint. (Schick, 233.)

In order to *begin* the proceedings for the beatification of Joan of Arc, Bishop Dupanloup gave Pope Pius IX 300,000 francs; his successor, Cardinal Coullie, gave to Pope Leo XIII 160,000 francs; Princess d' Estinac gave 260,000 francs; the diocese of Orleans gave 118,000 francs in 1904; English Catholics raised 200,000 francs—1,038,000 francs to *begin* the proceedings to call the Maid of Orleans "blessed"! To this pretty penny add the sums that all the other, many other, saints have sent to Rome!

In 1874 rules prohibiting abuses in the traffic of masses were issued. These had to be renewed by the Sacred Council on May 25, 1893: "Since in these last years it is plain that these salutary rules have often been neglected . . . and that abuses have prevailed largely and widely in this matter," etc. (Dearden, 174.)

The Spanish Government in the Philippines derived a revenue of nearly \$300,000 a year from the sale of indulgences,

which it sold over the same counter with tobacco, brandy, lottery tickets, and other articles, of which the Government retained the monopoly. (Bain, *Devel.*, 71.)

Pope Leo XIII, in his encyclical Letter "Satis Cognitum," of June 20, 1896, says: Cut off from the Catholic Church a man becomes a heretic. Separated from the Catholic Church a man is united to an adulteress. (p. 358.)

Replying to the "Association for Promoting the Unity of Christendom," Cardinal Patrizzi says, with the authority of the Holy Office, dated Rome, November 8, 1865: "Whosoever is separated from the one and only Catholic Church, however well he may believe himself to live, by this one sin of separation is in a state of wrath . . . out of which is neither salvation nor entrance into the kingdom of heaven." (Dearden, 61.)

St. Augustine says: "Those who are unjustly excommunicated are crowned of God in secret."

As "Universal Bishop," successor of Peter, Prince of the Apostles, the Pope claims sole right to make and unmake bishops, and absolute rule over every bishop and archbishop throughout the world.

In the oath of allegiance to the Pope the bishop-elect swears to remain faithful to the Holy See, and to extend and promote the rights, privileges, and powers of the See of Peter, and to persecute and fight all heretics and schismatics to the utmost of his ability, and undertake to visit Rome at stated intervals, and whenever specially summoned, and to give an account to the Pope of his whole pastoral office. (*Our Brief*, 42—44; Carl Mirbt, *Quellen z. Gesch. d. Papsttums*, 2. ed., 438.)

The absolute rule of the Pope may be seen from the Pastoral of Cardinal Langenieux, Archbishop of Rheims, dated July 20, 1904: "We renew our unbounded submission to the Vicar of Jesus Christ. His authority has no other limits than those which He Himself prescribes. We should consequently obey Him in everything He orders or counsels. We wish to be the first among you to practice that simple and prompt

obedience, which admits of neither hesitation nor calculation." (*Our Brief*, 44.)

In a letter to the *London Times* of August 1, 1904, the Catholic historian Dom Gasquet, O. S. B., writing as to the Pope's power "to deal directly with any individual bishop, when and how he may choose," asks: "How otherwise could any supreme spiritual authority govern the subjects who have taken an oath to obey him in all matters relating to that sphere?"

For the consequences of this papal rule carefully consider the words of Father Hyacinthe in the *London Times*, August 15, 1904: "France and Italy can only advance in proportion to their emancipation from 'this fatal servitude to a foreign power, which was never instituted by Christ, and which was unknown during the early centuries of the Church's history.'"

The Roman Catholic historian Lingard writes: "The Popes became sovereigns over sovereigns, and assumed the right of judging them in their Papal Courts, and of transferring their crowns as they thought just." (*A. B.*, 494.)

The papacy's "ideal of the Church is a universal empire spiritually, and, where it is possible, physically, ruled by a single monarch,—an empire of force and oppression, where the spiritual authority is aided by the secular arm in summarily suppressing every movement it dislikes." (*Janus, Preface*, XV.)

Gladstone writes: "Either the See and Court of Rome had . . . abandoned the dream of enforcing infallibility on the Church, or else by willful silence they were guilty of practicing upon the British Crown one of the blackest frauds recorded in history."

Cardinal Newman lamely says the Pope was no party to those declarations. Very well, but the Pope did not excommunicate those liars and perjurers! (*A. B.*, 493.)

Gladstone, in his "Vaticanism," says of the Pope's system that "its influence is adverse to freedom in the state, the family, and the individual. When weak, it is too often crafty, and when strong, tyrannical." He says it is the Pope's policy that

in "the Church of Rome nothing shall remain except an Asian monarchy,—nothing but one giddy height of despotism, and one dead level of religious subserviency."

"To assail this system is the Alpha and Omega of my desire, and it is to me a matter of regret that I am not able to handle it as it deserves without reflecting upon the persons, be they who they may, that have brought it into the world, have sedulously fed its weakness, have reared it up to its baleful maturity, have forced it upon those who now force it upon others, are obtaining for it from day to day fresh command over the pulpit, the press, the confessional, the teacher's chair, the bishop's throne." (*Anglican Brief*, 482. 483.)

"Deus vos impleat odio papae!" (Luther.)

Milwaukee, Wis.

W. DALLMANN.

THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION ACCORDING TO

Eph. 1, 3—14.

(From Stoeckhardt's Commentary.)

The passage which we have just explained is a *locus classicus* for the doctrine of the election of grace. Accordingly, we shall present once more, in a brief conspectus, the main points of the teaching regarding the eternal election of God which the apostle has here laid before us. We shall arrange them under a number of *capita doctrinae*, by grouping together equivalent terms and statements. To this end, we reproduce an article from *Lehre und Wehre* 1905, pp. 481 ff.

1. A few introductory remarks, to begin with. The doctrine of the election of grace is one of the clear doctrines of Scripture. There is sufficient light shed on it even by this one principal *sedes doctrinae* in Eph. 1, 3—14. The elements which constitute the essence of the eternal election stand forth in this text in sharp and distinct outlines. As far as God was pleased to reveal it to us, the eternal decree of election is here presented in simple and unequivocal terms. Occasionally we meet with a few expressions that might be controverted, as,

e. g., ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα, or ἐκκληρώθημεν; still, these expressions, whichever way they are explained, do not detract from the general understanding which this passage affords. The meaning which, in our opinion, is contained in ἐκκληρώθημεν, is attested by the unequivocal expression ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς. The interpretation which we have given to ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα is expressed, beyond a question, in the term περιποίησις, “a peculiar people” (“*Eigentumsvolk*”). The fact that the doctrine of the election of grace has actually become controverted to a great extent, both in former days and especially in our time, surely is no proof that in this instance we have before us an obscure or semi-obscure chapter of doctrine, — a chapter which, in the last analysis, is a mere problem of theology. If this were true, we should have to relegate also the article of the Holy Supper and of the divinity of Christ to the category of problems in theology. For these, too, have ever been greatly contested articles of doctrine. Theologians who have emancipated their reason from Scripture have attempted to doctor the divine mysteries, grafting some notion of theirs upon this passage and clipping something from another. These attempts do not render the respective declarations of Scripture obscure. Such a procedure can confuse only unstable and venturesome minds, but it cannot disarrange to simple minds the plain sense and understanding of the words of Scripture. To cite an instance, the manner in which the expressions ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς, or ἐν αὐτῷ, in v. 4, or πρόθεσις θεοῦ, in v. 11, are being manipulated does not throw these words which the Holy Ghost has taught into the shade, but sets them out in a strong light. These efforts show to what artifices persons must resort, in order to dodge the plain meaning of words.

2. The doctrine of the election of grace is a doctrine intended for Christians. In Eph. 1 Paul speaks to Christians and with Christians; such expressions as ἡμεῖς, ἡμᾶς embrace himself and all Christians. This doctrine cannot be grasped and understood, except by penitent and believing Christians who are sanctified by the Spirit of God, and are seeking those

things which are above. Thus, the primary doctrines of sin, of the wrath of God, of justification by grace for Christ's sake through faith, of sanctification, are treated in advance of the doctrine of election in the Epistle to the Romans, that *Compendium doctrinae Paulinae*. In the Epistle to the Ephesians, which was addressed to Christians tried and true, to whom Paul had for three years proclaimed the entire counsel of God, the apostle presupposes among his readers the knowledge and the salutary understanding of these principal articles of the Christian doctrine. When dealing with persons who have not become Christians as yet, and whom we desire to convert to Christianity, we speak to them of other matters, not of the election of grace. The doctrine of the election of grace is designed for Christians, and its intended purpose is to advance and stablish Christians in their faith. It is a doctrine abounding in comfort. The entire passage Eph. 1, 3—14 is a doxology, a glorification of the blessings of God. All that we read in this passage is sweet Gospel. Elsewhere, *e. g.*, in Rom. 8, 2 Thess. 2, 1 Pet. 1, the doctrine of the eternal election is applied for the comfort of Christians under the cross, in their sufferings and afflictions. In the Epistle to the Ephesians the apostle does not allude to the sufferings of Christians. At all times, in good as well as in evil days, Christians are in need of the comfort and strengthening which this doctrine affords them.

3. In Eph. 1 the apostle occupies the present standpoint of his Christian readers. He reminds them of the blessing which they possess at present, and from these blessings he directs their glance backward to the antemundane fountain from which those blessings have flowed. He identifies himself and his fellow-Christians with the elect.

¹⁾As regards the identification of Christians with the elect, and of the elect with Christians, I refer to the following passage in my Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans,

1) This paragraph is a footnote in the original. We have embodied it in the article proper because of its importance.

pp. 403. 404: "Throughout the Epistles of the apostles these terms, 'the called,' 'the saints,' 'the beloved,' 'the elect,' are used promiscuously. In our Lutheran Confessions such designations as 'the elect,' 'the Christians,' 'the children of God,' are used as interchangeable terms. When Scripture speaks of the elect, of those whom God has foreknown and predestinated, we are to think of believing Christians and are to embrace ourselves in the number of the elect. And when Scripture speaks of the Christians, of the believing children of God, we are to identify them with the elect. True, only those are elect who persevere in faith unto the end and are ultimately glorified. However, throughout the Scriptures the believing Christians are viewed and described as persons whose abiding characteristic is faith, and who obtain the end of faith, the salvation of their souls. Accordingly, in his explanation of the Third Article of the Creed, Luther defines the Christian Church, or the communion of saints, or believers, as 'entire Christendom,' whom the Holy Ghost 'calls, gathers, enlightens, sanctifies, and preserves with Jesus Christ in the one true faith.' True, we know from experience that many who had obtained faith apostatize sooner or later. Moreover, Scripture issues earnest warnings against defection from the faith, and speaks of time-believers. However, what we are to think of time-believers is written on another page in our Bible; that is a truth by itself which we are not to mingle with the declarations of Scripture concerning the election of the children of God unto everlasting life. For these declarations treat only of such persons as believe and are saved." Comp. *Lehre und Wehre* 1905, pp. 199—201: "It is apparent from the passages of Scripture and of the Confessions which were adduced above, and from many similar passages, what kind of persons are meant by the terms 'believers,' 'all believers,' viz., those whose permanent characteristic is faith, who are now in a state of faith and believe unto the end, the *finaliter credentes*. Those who for a time fall from faith and return to faith again are not specially considered in these passages. *Apropos*, when the

entire life even of these persons, from the moment of their conversion to the hour of their death, is to be passed upon in a summary judgment, they, too, must receive the predicate 'believers.' For, since they are reconverted, their former defections are remembered no more. When Scripture says: 'He that believeth, *πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων*, shall be saved,' it is plain that the expression *πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων* signifies the abiding relation and conduct of these persons toward Christ, — that relation in which they are still found when the final sentence is proclaimed which decides either a person's eternal life or death. When we confess that God 'will on the last day raise me and all the dead, and give unto me and all believers in Christ eternal life,' we refer to those who are living in a state of faith and pass through faith still believing. Aye, the term 'believers,' when unqualified, both in Scripture and our Confessions, denotes the *finaliter credentes*. This idiomatic use of the term appears not only in the particular statements of Scripture afore cited, in which eternal life is attributed to believers in curt and direct terms, but it pervades the entire Scriptures. Wherever Scripture describes the believing Christians, it characterizes them as persons who live and die in faith. In the exordium of his First Epistle the Apostle Peter embraces himself and all believing Christians in one comprehensive statement, when he says: 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to His abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope.' Proceeding, he characterizes the regenerate, the believers, as persons who are kept by the power of God in faith, whose faith is tried and tested by the fire of tribulation, and who receive the end of their faith, the salvation of their souls. According to Rom. 8, 15. 16, the believing Christians are children of God, who cry 'Abba, Father,' and with whose spirit the Spirit itself beareth witness that they are the children of God. Yea, 'ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus,' Gal. 3, 26. However, it is just to these children of God, to all the children of God, that the state-

ment applies: 'If children, then heirs,' Rom. 8, 17, 'heirs according to the promise,' Gal. 3, 29. In the terminology of Scripture the children of God are simply those who are now in a filial relation to God and will later obtain the inheritance of children. And the abstract term 'faith' is used in the same sense as the concrete 'believer.' Wherever Scripture commends faith, wherever it testifies that we are justified and saved by faith, it conceives of faith, just as of the righteousness of faith, as a *continuum*, as something which endures until faith passes into sight, and eternal bliss follows justification. This idiomatic use of the terms has passed over into ecclesiastical parlance. The passage in the Form of Concord which says that 'God has considered in His eternal counsel the conversion, justification, and salvation of every Christian,' defines a Christian as a person who is converted, is righteous before God, and is saved. In the Third Article of the Christian Creed we confess that the Church is the communion of saints, or of believers. This means, according to Luther's explanation, all Christendom throughout the earth, whom the Holy Ghost calls, gathers, enlightens, sanctifies, and keeps with Jesus Christ in the one true faith. Aye, also preservation in faith belongs to the concept of faith, of being a Christian, and of the Church. Indeed, Scripture speaks also of time-believers, who believe for a season and then fall away,—fall away finally and are lost, Luke 8, 13. And we shall allow no appeal to the consistency of reasoning to prompt us to the statement that the faith of time-believers is a specious faith. Time-believers actually believe; they are inwardly in touch with the Lord while they are believers. Aye, there are men who have tasted the good Word of God and the powers of the world to come, and yet fall away, Hebr. 6, 5. 6. This is a fact established by Scripture. However, it is contrary to Scripture to divide 'believers' into two classes: such as believe unto the end and are saved, and such as believe for a time, and then fall away and are lost. It is wrong to compute the number of believers thus: 1. the *finaliter credentes*; 2. the

time-believers; total: all believers. It is vulgar rationalism, and a bad attempt at conciliation, to gather the believing children of God, strictly and emphatically so called, and the time-believers into one concept, and, as is being done, to construct the idea of faith from a study of the time-believers, and in the very premises to posit the possibility of a defection as part of the concept of faith. True, every believing Christian still is in the flesh, and hence must be careful not to indulge his flesh and thus lose the Spirit. But the believer, in so far as he is a believer, knows of no defection. It is to the believer an impossible thought to imagine that his faith could ever cease. True faith is assurance, assurance of present and future salvation, an assurance which never fails. We do indeed lay to heart what Scripture says concerning the time-believers. We take them as a warning example. But we absolutely refuse to take the time-believers as our teachers and guides who are to show us what constitutes faith and how we are to believe. Those theologians who, when speaking of faith and salvation, always enter the time-believers as an element in their argumentation, should, indeed, have a care, lest they rob those whom they are teaching of the true understanding of what saving faith is. No, indeed! it is not so, that the time-believers are necessarily included in the general concept of faith. Hence the time-believers do not belong to the elect."

Thus the apostle teaches us how to view the eternal election of God *a posteriori*. Scripture, indeed, speaks elsewhere, in unqualified terms and in an objective view of the matter, of the elect whom God predestinated, of the elect as being few in number, while there are many who are called. However, wherever the apostles instruct Christians regarding the mystery of eternity, they apply what they say to those whom they are teaching. This direct and practical manner of considering the subject keeps us from useless and dangerous speculations. If you wish to think and speak correctly concerning the election of grace, you must learn, from close

observation of Scripture, also the *modus loquendi* and the correct method. There is a different ring, and there is a different impression created, whether you say that God, before the foundation of the world, has elected us unto faith, unto the adoption of sons, unto salvation; or whether you point to some undefined persons, concerning whom God decreed in eternity that He would bring them unto faith and save them.

So much it was necessary to say, in a general way, concerning the character of the doctrine which this passage invites us to consider. As regards our election, Paul now submits for our meditation on Eph. 1 the following comforting and edifying facts of our faith.

4. God has chosen us before the foundation of the world. In this statement God is the subject, and we Christians,—we who are now Christians,—are the object of the divine election. Paul knows only of an election of persons, not of an election of means. The appointment of the means of salvation, of the means of grace, is a procedure entirely different from the choosing of the elect. The election of grace is an election of persons, and that, of individuals (*“Personenwahl und Einzelwahl”*). A goodly proportion of our modern theologians reject the election of individuals, and represent the divine election as pertaining only to the Church *in genere*. However, what else is the Christian Church than the entire Christendom throughout the world, the sum total of all believing Christians? Now, all that is predicable of the total number of Christians is predicable of the individual Christians composing that number. God has chosen us, *ἡμᾶς*. With this term the apostle refers to himself and his Christian readers, to all his fellow-Christians; and he would have each individual Christian to consider himself embraced in this word *ἡμᾶς*. Election is an individualizing act. In electing, God has referred to me, aye, even to me in particular, to me individually, to me *in concreto*, to me personally. God has chosen us before the foundation of the world. Election *xar-*

ἐξοχήν is an antemundane, eternal act of God, hence, an act of the will, a counsel, a decree, of God. Before the world was, before we existed, God, even the great, eternal God, the Lord of heaven and earth, has bestowed His attention on us,—on me,—humble and poor creatures that we are. In His reflections, in His eternal counsel and decree, He has picked us—me—from out of the world, out of the *massa perditā*, and has ordained that we are to belong to Him, that we are to be His own. What a comfort for us Christians, who are strangers in the world and often regard ourselves as a negligible cipher in this world!

5. Furthermore, Eph. 1 defines for us more closely the contents and purpose of our election. The relation into which we have been placed to God by the eternal election is called the adoption of children. God has predestinated us unto the adoption of children, *viz.*, that we were to become the children of God through Christ. Our relation to God was to be, not that of creatures, nor that of slaves or servants, nor that of friends and confidants, but that of children. He was to be our Father, and we His dear children. And being His children, we were to have our conversation before Him, holy and blamelessly, in love. God desired to be glorified among men, even here in time, by us as His children who are showing forth the praises of God to the world. Predestination unto the adoption of children, however, embraces also predestination unto the inheritance of children. Even before the foundation of the world our Heavenly Father has decreed and conveyed to us all that He possesses as the original owner, the bliss and glory of heaven. And in predestinating us unto the adoption of children and everlasting life God has at the same time, from the beginning, ordained in what manner He would bring us—me—unto justifying and saving faith, and preserve us therein. Moreover, He has preordained and prearranged all the changes of fortune in our lives in such a manner, that they must serve the attainment of the highest purpose of life, *viz.*, faith, our adoption as children, and salvation. What

love, what honor our Father in heaven has conferred on us by choosing us, before we had our being, to be His children, and by preordaining all that is included in the adoption of children!

6. We are not worthy of such love and honor. Verily, there is in us no lovable and attractive trait that could prompt, and did prompt, God to elect us. We belong by nature to the degenerate and corrupt race of men, who are an abomination to God. The reason why God, by His eternal election, chose us from out of this race of men and predestinated us that we should be His own, is not furnished in any way by our disposition or character, by our acts and conduct. This entire passage Eph. 1, 3—14 does not offer the least ground for assuming that, in electing us, God somehow took into consideration our conduct. On the contrary, these expressions: ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς, ἐκκληρώθημεν, εὐδοκία, πρόθεσις, bar every consideration of this kind. For these expressions represent the eternal act of the will of God as a free act, the motive for which is found exclusively in God Himself. We have been predestinated unto the adoption of children and the inheritance of everlasting life according to the good pleasure of His will, simply because it pleased God to do so. We have been predestinated to the praise of the glory of His grace, because God wished to show forth in us the glory of His grace. What prompted and moved God to elect us, us, — me, — is His grace and mercy. And that, His grace in Christ. God has elected us by Christ, whom He has foreordained before the foundation of the world to be the Redeemer of sinful men. In the eyes of God the merit of Christ has from the beginning covered our unworthiness, and has attracted to us unworthy beings the attention and good pleasure of God. These are the only causes of our eternal election: the mercy of God and the merits of Christ; the former is the *causa impulsiva*, the latter the *causa meritoria*. Verily, our eternal election rests on a firm and immovable foundation. We shall not permit ourselves to doubt it when observing how unworthy we are of being elected.

7. By grace, for Christ's sake, God has before the foundation of the world elected us, me, every single one of us, unto the adoption of children and unto everlasting life. The election of grace is an election of individuals. However, the individuals whom God has elected form a whole, τὰ πάντα, a people, a peculiar people, περποιήσις. Compared to the world, the *massa perditā*, from out of which they have been elected, the elect are few in number. Still, we are not to picture to ourselves the eternal election as an act by which God picked from the wreck and ruin of the world a paltry few who are saved; but we are ever to keep before our spiritual eye the great and "noble company" of the elect children. The elect, — as many as there are, and ever were, of them in the world, — when viewed in their totality, as God views them, are seen to be a great and respectable people. This was the aim of the eternal counsel and plan of the love of God: to raise up out of the human race a great family of children of God, united and compacted in Christ, in whom they were chosen; a family on whom rests the entire good pleasure of the Father in heaven which rests on the eternal Son of His love; a family of many generations of children, πατρίαι, Eph. 3, 15, gathered from all nations of the earth, and showing forth, in union with the various generations of God in heaven, the holy angels, the praises of God forever and ever; yea, we add, on the strength of Eph. 3, 9. 10: an eternal Church, the *kosmos* of God and its race of men, in whom there is ultimately realized, after the destruction of the apostate world of men who refused to be saved, the purpose of God's creation, the will and good pleasure of Him who has made all things. What an honor for us to be members of this great family of God! In the communion of the elect we find abundant comfort and compensation for the contempt and repulsion which we meet in the world.

8. The eternal choice or election of God is further described in Eph. 1 by significant expressions, especially such as state the infallibility of the election. God has predesti-

nated us unto the adoption of children, and to the inheritance of children as well. However, the predestination of God is irrevocable, more so than the laws of the Medes and Persians. We are predestinated "after the counsel of His own will." God took counsel with Himself in eternity. He considered the matter and after mature deliberation reached the conclusion that we, we in particular, I myself and my fellow-Christians, were to become His children and heirs of everlasting life. Now, of the counsel of the Lord we read: "The counsel of the Lord standeth forever, the thoughts of His heart to all generations," Ps. 33, 11. We have been predestinated *κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ*. However, *εὐδοκία*, the good pleasure of God, as Polykarp Leyser remarks, is such that even the gates of hell and myriads of devils cannot thwart it. We have been predestinated "according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will." Man does not, and cannot, execute all that he proposes. It is a divine prerogative to execute and to realize all that He has proposed. Thus, the purpose of the election, too, cannot fail. And what a great comfort it is to us Christians to know our adoption and salvation has not been committed to our hands, "out of which it might easily be taken and snatched, owing to the weakness and malice of our flesh and the guile and power of the devil and the world," but that God has taken our adoption and salvation into His almighty hand, and "has well secured it in His eternal purpose which cannot fail or be thwarted." God has fixed in advance the number, the sum total of the elect, *τὰ πάντα, τὸ πλήρωμα*. And hence, not a single one can drop out of this number. Verily, then, a Christian must be glad and assured of his salvation. Such assurance of salvation is, indeed, a characteristic feature of Christian faith. Thus the comfort derived from our election serves for our edification in our most holy faith.

9. God has even now, for a good part, carried out His eternal purpose. In Eph. 1 the apostle points emphatically to the execution of the eternal counsel of God. Even to Adam,

later to Abraham and Israel, God gave the promise, and by the promise He quickened the elect from the race of Adam and Abraham to faith, to the hope of the future Christ. But God is employed in the gathering of the elect children especially in the present eon, in the time of the New Testament. He has now sent the Gospel of Christ, and many Gentiles have so far heard and believed the Gospel of their salvation and thus become the children of God. The entire work of the Church, the preaching of the Gospel, serves this purpose and has this effect, *viz.*, to gather the elect from all the ends of the earth. We, too, have heard and believed the Gospel of our salvation, and have obtained the adoption of children. The entire course of our life hitherto was a pedagogical effort of God, which aimed at our faith and adoption. We have known Christ, and in Christ we have the redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins; in Him we have a God who is reconciled to us, we have God for our Father. Moreover, God has blessed us with all wisdom and prudence, and thus enabled us to lead a godly life. This, however, is the exact blessing which He designed for us in eternity.

10. Accordingly, God will continue until the end to carry out His eternal counsel and purpose regarding us and our elect fellow-Christians, in order that we may reach the final goal of our predestination. We were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, the earnest of our future inheritance. The Holy Spirit secures to God those who are His, whom He has chosen from the beginning, and He preserves our souls and keeps them steadfast in the Word and faith until the day of redemption. The inheritance of children cannot and will not fail us. The Lord will surely deliver us from all evil, remove us entirely from this world, and preserve us unto His heavenly kingdom. With all the elect of God, with the entire congregation of the saints of God made perfect, we shall then behold the glory of God and praise Him forever and ever, because He has so gloriously carried out what He purposed to do in eternity.

When a Christian has finished reading the passage Eph. 1, 3—14, has pondered and taken to heart its comforting contents, and has appropriated them, he joins the apostle in giving thanks to God and the Father of Jesus Christ for all the temporal and eternal blessings of which he has been reminded in this passage, and he experiences no desire and inclination to make the mystery of eternity the subject of conjectures and speculations. Still, a question or two will arise which he cannot entirely push aside. When the eternal choice and election, which is particular in concept and essence, has been presented to him, he is apt to inquire, What is my fate? Do I belong to the elect? How can I know and be assured that I am elect? These are the inquiries of anxious souls who are concerned about their salvation, inquiries which flow from a sense of our need of salvation. We may expect *a priori* that Scripture, which teaches and offers us all that pertains to our salvation, will answer these questions. We find these questions actually answered in Eph. 1. The apostle in this passage speaks of the elect whom God has chosen, however, not merely in a general way, but he employs such terms as “we,” “us,” “you,” thus showing that he regards and designates the Christians as the elect. Hence, if a person can say, I am a Christian, he is to know and believe that he is elect. However, Paul in Eph. 1 explains at greater length wherein Christianity consists, and what we are and possess as Christians. These marks of Christianity, then, are also marks and tests of our election. The 11th Article of the Form of Concord in an extensive section treats the question how the individual Christian may know and be assured that he is one of the elect, and in this connection it refers to Eph. 1 as showing that God does not lead, and has not decreed to lead, His elect to salvation by any other way than the well-known universal way of salvation. To those whom God has elected in eternity He has the Word, the Gospel, proclaimed, proclaimed here in time; these He leads to faith, pardons and justifies them through faith; for just these people have been predestinated to the adoption of sons and to a holy and blameless conver-

sation in love. Accordingly, every Christian may and should draw this conclusion and say: I am, indeed, a poor sinner, deserving of no mercy, but I believe in Jesus Christ, who has redeemed me with His blood, and in whom I obtain grace and the forgiveness of sins. Through Christ I am a child of God, and though in much weakness, I now follow after holiness; I am walking so as to please God, my Heavenly Father, in every respect. Hence, I belong to the elect; for just these features are the marks of the elect. The entire present state of a Christian is a realization of God's eternal decree of election, a consequence and effect of election. This thought runs through the entire passage Eph. 1, 3—14. Thus I am justified in reasoning from the effect to the cause. The aforementioned manifestations of Christianity, repentance, faith, sanctification, are, indeed, of a subjective nature. In seasons of severe affliction the entire inward life of faith is shaken. And it is at such times that the inner marks of election become faint. Just that is the character of such spiritual trials as afflict seriously minded Christians, *viz.*, that they are on the point of questioning their own faith, that they begin to doubt whether their faith is of the genuine kind, that the consciousness of their child-state becomes dimmed, and that they are fearful lest their obedience and devotion are an utter sham and fraud. However, granted that the *notae internae electionis* are not always available, still the apostle in Eph. 1 points out also a *nota externa*, the Word of Truth, the Gospel of our salvation, which is exalted to the height of heaven above all vacillations and moods of the human heart, above all subjective occurrences and experiences, feelings and sensations, of a Christian. Accordingly, those whom God has chosen in eternity have the Gospel presented to them for that very reason. It is a special blessing of God which the apostle mentions in the words ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον, alongside of and prior to πιστεύσαντες; and this blessing flows from the eternal election of God. Hence, following the apostle's direction, I may and must draw this conclusion: Here is the Gospel of Christ with its precious promises, the universal promises of

grace, which are meant for every one that hears them, hence, for me also. And this Gospel is the Gospel of my salvation, which gives also to me the assurance that I shall be saved. What the Gospel promises is most certainly true. The Gospel is the Word of Truth. I hear the Gospel, the Word of Truth, with my ears. I hear, and I can read with mine own eyes, that God would have me to be saved. Consequently, it is beyond doubt that I, too, am elect.

A different kind of question which arises when men, also when Christians meditate the election of God, is this, What is the fate of the rest? We are not better than others; others are not worse than ourselves. Why did God elect us—me—rather than others? *Cur nos prae aliis?* This question does not arise from the desire to be saved, but from curiosity. It is a presumptuous question. And such presumptuous questions are not answered by Scripture, which reveals to us only what is useful for us to know, and what tends to our salvation. The information which the apostle offers in Eph. 1, 3—14 refers exclusively to Christians; it treats only of the elect and of the salvation of the elect, and does not say a word of the rest and of the fate of the rest. And in another place, Rom. 9—11, the apostle absolutely forbids Christians to try to discover the *discretio personarum*, and he counts the *causa discriminis* as one of the things which God has purposely concealed from us. Humble Christians promptly accept this direction, and suppress all presumptuous questions as soon as they arise in them. All manner of reflections and inferences are connected with the question: *Cur nos prae aliis?* Those who give the reins to their own thoughts at this point may reason thus: We are to be persuaded that it is a result and effect of the eternal election that we Christians believe the Gospel, that we have become the children of God by faith, and have been sealed with the Holy Spirit who keeps us from falling away. It follows, then, that, if others do not believe the Gospel, or fall away from faith, and are finally lost, the eternal background is lacking in their case; God, in electing, has passed them by. If God had elected them, they would

also believe and be saved. It is reason in its rude and carnal state which draws such conclusions, and with dirty hands manipulates and maltreats divine mysteries. Passages of Scripture, like Eph. 1, which treat of the election of grace, do not offer the slightest foothold for such reflections; they speak only of the election of grace, of the eternal divine decree which has for its objects the elect children of God, and they do not even remotely point to some decree of God, or to some omission on the part of God, which might be considered the *causa adaequata* of unbelief and of the damnation of many who are lost. And in other places Scripture teaches expressly that unbelief, defection, damnation have their cause in man himself, are incurred by man's own guilt, and that God has neglected or omitted no effort to save even those who will not be saved.

²⁾True, a discrepancy remains to our reasonable view of the matter between the statements of Scripture regarding the cause of salvation and the cause of damnation, inasmuch as Scripture ascribes the former to God alone, the latter to man alone. To our reasonable view a discrepancy remains between the particular election of grace and the universal gracious will of God; but this discrepancy is not *contradictio in adjecto*, since the election of grace and the gracious will of God are essentially different concepts. Our reason is ever inclined to draw this inference that those who are finally saved did not resist the Word and Spirit of God as determinedly as others, or that God did not will the salvation of those who are finally lost as earnestly as He willed the salvation of the elect. Every attempt to logically compose this difference leads either to Calvinism or synergism. As far as our salvation, and our need of salvation, is concerned, it is sufficient if we hold, without an attempt at curtailment, both sides of the truth, and leave it to God to conciliate this difference. True theology halts at the limits of the divine revelation.

Verily, a Christian who meditates on the grace of God, —

2) Footnote in the original.

also the eternal grace, — which has been bestowed on him, will not permit his look into the abyss of the divine mercy to become dimmed and obscured by useless questions and musings by which neither he nor others are profited. He will, rather, thank God for the salvation which has been brought to him, and he will leave God to do and deal with others as He sees fit.

There is, indeed, a pertinent question that may be raised as regards the salvation or damnation of men. There is a pertinent question that concerns the fate of our fellowmen. The question which is of primary importance, and most readily suggests itself, is concerning the salvation of our own soul, our standing with God, our relation to God, and God's relation to us. When facing God, we are not concerned about the rest and their relation to Him. But a person who is concerned about the salvation of his own soul seriously considers the salvation of his fellowmen after his own affairs with God have been adjusted. And when we have to do with men who do not know the way of peace, we do not speak to them of the election of grace and do not speculate about election or non-election. A missionary, every Christian, has a call to do mission work; he has something better to engage him than unprofitable questions on which he may speculate without ever solving them. We speak to the lost children whom we would like to save of Jesus Christ, the Savior of all men, also of the chiefest sinners. We assure them in the name of God that God would have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth. God has no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his evil way and live. Repent, therefore, and believe the Gospel! Moreover, we know that these words have the power to convert sinners and to soften hard hearts. And if a person absolutely will not hear us, we declare to him, It is your own fault, if you are lost; you do not deem yourself worthy of eternal life. This earnest warning and reproof may cause him to reflect and reconsider his attitude before it is too late. Those, now, who are struck and won over by such pleading, warning, and reproof we greet as brethren elect with us, and rejoice over

the increase which the household of God of which we are members has experienced through their return. Hence, the election of grace, and faith in our eternal election, do not hinder us in carrying out the duty which we owe to our neighbor, in executing our Christian calling on earth. The comfort derived from the election of grace, our assurance of salvation, is no reason why we should be inactive and resign ourselves to idle security. On the contrary, any person who for his part is certain of salvation, who believes with his whole heart that God has elected him unto salvation before the foundation of the world, will employ every day of his life, and all his strength, in aiding others to obtain salvation. The election of grace enables us to rightly understand what the grace of God is; and the more firmly we become grounded in the grace of God and in our knowledge of divine grace, the more able, proficient, and willing we become to praise and commend the grace of God to others and to proclaim to our fellowmen the universal gracious will of God.

THE PROOF TEXTS OF THE CATECHISM WITH A PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.

THE SECOND ARTICLE.

(Continued.)

THE STATE OF HUMILIATION.

Phil. 2, 5—8: *Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus, who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.*

"Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus." Christ is set forth as a pattern from which Christians should copy. What mind was in Christ? *"He humbled Himself."*

So Christ is a pattern of humility for the Christians. This is the scope of the present passage, and must not be overlooked in its interpretation. *Baldwin*: "Hoc observetur tantum scopus apostoli nostri, cui propositum non est, docere, quomodo Filius Dei carnem assumerit, sed quomodo Jesus Christus in sua humanitate formam servi assumerit *et hoc ipso exemplum humilitatis suis reliquerit.*" At the same time we have in this text the *sedes doctrinae* for the state of humiliation.

1. *Who humbled Himself?* "*He,*" "*Christ Jesus.*" Let us mark this well! Christ Jesus humbled Himself, the God-man, this Person who possesses a divine and a human nature, this theanthropic person. So who is humiliated and afterwards exalted? The *person* of Christ Jesus. *Quenstedt*: "Subjectum quod est persona τοῦ λόγου, non qua *ἀσαρξος* et incarnanda, sed qua *ἐνσαρξος* et incarnata." The entire context bears out this statement. Of the *Χριστὸς ἐνσαρξος* only the apostle can say that He "made Himself of no reputation," "He humbled Himself," and, later, that He "was exalted."

2. *According to which nature did Christ humble Himself?* According to His *human* nature. For *a priori*: the *divine* nature cannot be abased and cannot be exalted; it is immutable. *In Deum non cadit mutatio.* Again: The apostle says: "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus,"—be humble! According to His *divine* nature Christ would not be presented to us as an example whom we were to follow. And again: The text says: He took upon Himself the form of a servant; He was made in the likeness of men; found in fashion as a man; He died—all of which can be said of the *human* nature only.

3. *Wherein does the humiliation not consist?* Not in the assumption of the human nature. One may call that a condescension, but not humiliation in the Biblical sense of the term. If His humiliation had consisted in His assumption of the human nature, His exaltation would consist in the laying aside of His human nature, and Christ would no longer be the God-man! The text does not say: "He was made *man*," but: "He was made *in the likeness* of men." Furthermore, as we have

seen, the subject of the whole discourse is Christ Jesus, the God-man. This theanthropic person, possessing a divine and a human nature, "*was made in the likeness of men,*" "*took upon Himself the form of a servant.*" So "*the form of a servant*" is not equivalent to His human nature, because that He already had and hence could not "*take upon Himself.*"

4. *What, then, is the state of humiliation?* St. Paul says: "*Christ Jesus, being*" — existing — "*in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made Himself of no reputation,*" etc. What is *the form of God*? Clearly not the *divine* nature, otherwise *the form of a servant* were His *human* nature; of this *form of a servant*, however, Christ divested Himself, consequently that would be asserting that Christ is no longer true man. *Form, μορφή, Gestalt*, is the external manifestation, it is that whereby one is known, is seen; *form of God* is the external manifestation of God, that whereby God is known, is seen. The *essence* of God is presupposed; only He who possesses the *essence* of God can exist in the *form* of God. The *form* is the manifestation of the *essence*. God only can appear in the form of God. Since Christ is in *the form of God*, He is true God. God is invisible; still a *form, Gestalt*, is predicated of Him. The *form* of God is that whereby this invisible God manifests Himself as God. The *μορφή θεοῦ* is equivalent to the *δόξα θεοῦ*, *the glory of God*, John 1, 14, i. e., the aggregate of all divine attributes, especially His omnipotence, His omniscience, and His omnipresence. "The Word was made flesh," says St. John, "and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the Only-Begotten of the Father." By the manifestation of His divine attributes, of His divine majesty, they saw this *man* Christ is almighty, this *man* is God.

"Being in the form of God," Christ was "equal with God." *Ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων* = "*in the form of God existing;*" *ὑπάρχων* = existing — is a very emphatic participle. It shows: 1. that Christ *did not take upon Himself* the form of God, as it is said that He "*took upon Himself the form of a servant,*" but that *He existed in it*; 2. that with the form of God Christ

is said to have possessed, at the same time, a divine essence and nature; that Christ Jesus, when He had taken upon Himself *the form of a servant*, neither laid aside the divine nature itself, nor in any way resigned the form of God. (Quenstedt.) — Christ existed in the form of God, and hence could have exercised it to its fullest extent, could have always made use of His divine majesty imparted to Him according to His human nature; He could at all times have acted as God, so that all might have seen this *μορφή θεοῦ* at all times. But this He did not do. For the text reads: "*He thought it not robbery to be equal with God,*" i. e., He possessed the equality with God, but did not think this a thing of booty that should be used as a means of self-glorification. And that He did not look upon this being equal with God as robbery, as booty, may be seen from the fact that he manifested this form of God, His divine majesty, only now and then in the service of the brethren, but not for His own honor and glory. —

So Christ might at all times have made use of this *form of God*. He did not—for a purpose: He wanted to become our Substitute and Savior, and so He "*made Himself of no reputation,*" etc. That is to say, as a rule, He laid aside the use of His divine majesty communicated to His human nature. He became a man like unto ourselves; He became a servant instead of a master; He humbled Himself so deeply as to die the death of a vile criminal on the cross; and all this He did for our sakes.

5. *Rays of glory.* The passages cited in the Catechism prove conclusively that Christ possessed "the form of God," divine majesty, in the state of humiliation. John 2, 11 says that by the miracle of His turning water into wine Christ "*manifested forth His glory.*" John 11, 40 ff. speaks of the climax of Christ's miracles, the raising of Lazarus. John 18, 6 tells us that with the words, "I am He," Christ felled His captors to the ground. Aye, indeed, this man Jesus is almighty. Instances might be multiplied. Read Matt. 8, 23—27, which relates His stilling the tempest. In v. 24 we read: "He was

asleep." Here we see the form of the servant: He slept. "He was made in the likeness of men;" like other men He was in need of sleep; "He was found in fashion like a man." Reading v. 26, we behold "the form of God." The danger to that frail craft was exceedingly great, but the angry waves were obedient to His will. "He rebuked the winds and the sea; and there was a great calm." Whenever it pleased Him, He could make use of His divine majesty, as here. In v. 27 the men marveling say: "What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey Him?" He is "in the likeness of men," just like other men; yet He must be something greater. He cannot be from the earth, He must be from heaven! They saw the form of God, the majesty of God. They saw He was "equal with God." And it was not robbery on the part of Christ to act as He did act, for He was God even in the state of humiliation.—Or take Mark 5, 41 ff. The daughter of Jairus was dead. Christ had said, "The damsel is not dead." "They laughed Him to scorn." He was in fashion as a man; this they saw. The girl was dead; this they knew. Christ brought her to life: "Talitha, cumi!" The sneers were turned into astonishment; they saw the form of God.

We append a running commentary. "*Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus,*" be humble, "*who, being*"—existing—"in the form of God," having in or about Him that whereby God is known, seen, or manifested as God, "*thought it not robbery to be equal with God,*" counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, esteemed it not rapine to be equal with God. In ancient times the victors looked upon their booty as upon a means of self-glorification and so used it. Thus Christ did not look upon His being equal with God; He did not make a boast, a display, of it; He did not use it constantly and fully, "*but,*" though He could have done so, "*He made Himself of no reputation,*" He emptied Himself. What this means the preceding context reveals negatively: He did not make a boast of His equality with

God. The succeeding context states the thought positively: He emptied Himself, "*taking the form of a servant.*" Christ, the God-man, who also according to His human nature possessed all power in heaven and on earth; who, also according to His human nature in the state of humiliation was the Lord of lords, He, whom the heavenly hosts would gladly have served at all times, came to serve others, to serve, to redeem us. The concept *form of a servant* is developed in the next phrases: "*being made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man.*" He was a man like other men, yet without sin. This "likeness" was manifested: He ate, He drank, He wept, He slept; thus He was "found in fashion as a man;" thus "*He humbled Himself.*" He did it; it was an act of His; willingly He humbled Himself. Willingly, for our sakes, He forewent high stations, honors, prerogatives, which He might rightfully claim and enjoy. And when the apostle says: "*and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross,*" he indicates the last stage of humiliation, the climax of self-humiliation. So deeply Christ humbled Himself that He died the death of a vile criminal—for us! On the cross He cried out, "It"—the work of redemption—"is finished!" That was the purpose of His humiliation—our salvation! That was the reason why He did not employ His divine majesty constantly which He at all times possessed. The purpose of His humiliation was to swallow death up into victory, that we might bless God, saying: "Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ!"

The Conception of Christ.

Luke 1, 35: *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.*

The angel Gabriel was sent to Mary, a descendant of David. His sudden appearance and unusual greeting amaze Mary. The angel tells her, she, the virgin, is to become the

mother of a son whom God will have named Jesus, Savior. This her son is at the same time to be the Son of God, and is to fulfill the prophecies concerning the son of David, the eternal King of Israel. Mary asks wonderingly, "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?" Gabriel explains matters, saying, "*The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee,*" and thus "*the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee,*" and in the power of God, the Holy Ghost, Mary shall conceive. Here, then, we have a proof passage for the words of the Creed: "Conceived by the Holy Ghost." What we are here told is wonderfully corroborated by the account of Christ's conception, Matt. 1, 18: "She (Mary) was found with child of (*ex*) *the Holy Ghost,*" and by the divine message of the angel to Joseph: "Fear not to take unto thee Mary, thy wife; for that which is *conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost,*" v. 20.

Her son, so Mary is told, will not owe his existence as man to a human father, but to the miraculous operation of the Holy Ghost, and hence "*also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.*" Here Christ's humanity and divinity are asserted. Mary's son is the Son of God. "*That holy thing which shall be born of thee*": thus the child of the Virgin Mary is distinguished from all other children of men. Man, born according to the common course of nature, is sinful. What is born of the flesh is flesh. Mary's son, however, is "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners," Hebr. 7, 26; "in Him is no sin," 1 John 3, 5; He knows of no sin, 2 Cor. 5, 21. Mary's son is the Son of God. A miraculous conception, a wonderful birth! If asked how it came to pass, we answer with the theologians of old:

Quid sit nasci, quid processus,
Me nescire sum professus.

The Birth of Christ.

Is. 9, 6: *Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given.*

Seven centuries before the Christian era Isaiah prophesied of Christ's conception and birth, saying: "Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call His name Im-

manuel," Is. 7, 14; and again: "Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given." Noting the context of the latter passage, we observe the prophet speaking of a great light shining to a people walking in darkness. The result of the illumination shed by that light is joy, great joy. Who is this great light? Immanuel. He is the cause of all this gladness. As to the structure of this passage, we notice that the prophet has employed the *parallelismus membrorum*, which abounds in Hebrew poetry. The two members virtually express the same thought, the latter enforcing the former, thus throwing more light upon it. "*A Child is born,*" a child of human flesh and blood. This Child is a *son*. Immanuel, Christ, is true man. This Child is *given*. Christ here appears as a gift, a gracious gift of God. God's grace impelled Him to bestow this gift upon us. It is a wonderful Child indeed. Commonly speaking, a child is born unto his parents, but this Child is born *unto us*, is given *unto us*, unto all people. And man, walking in darkness, all his thoughts, words, and deeds being enmity against God, had and has need of this *Child*, this *Son*. Man, without Him, must be damned everlastingly. Only the true believers, however, who know what a precious gift He is, can exult with the prophet: "Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given!" — And as to the fulfillment of the prophecy see Matt. 1, 21 ff.: "And she" (the Virgin Mary) "shall bring forth a *son*, and thou shalt call His name *Jesus*, for He shall save His people from their sins. Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying: Behold, a *virgin* shall be with *child*, and shall bring forth a *son*, and they shall call His name *Immanuel*, which, being interpreted, is, God with us." Cf. Luke 2, 41; John 1, 14; Gal. 4, 4.

The Burial of Christ.

Ps. 16, 10: *Thou wilt not suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption.*

This passage is quoted by Peter in his great discourse on the day of Pentecost, Acts 2, 27. This proves beyond doubt

that Christ is God's *Holy One*. When the psalmist says of the *Holy One*, the God-man, that He is not "*to see corruption*," he speaks of Him according to that nature according to which He had flesh and blood, and according to which He might have seen corruption had He not been the *Holy One*. This truth, so plainly stated in the Old Testament, finds its corroboration in the New. Christ's sacred body was laid in the sepulcher and remained there to the third day without seeing corruption.

The Purpose of Christ's Humiliation.

Christ was not compelled to undergo this humiliation, but He did it willingly, out of love to us. In this state He carried out the work of redemption. Hence, in answer to the question, "For what purpose did Christ thus humiliate Himself?" our Catechism says: "To redeem me, a lost and condemned sinner."—This topic, having frequently been dwelt upon in the explanation of preceding passages, needs but brief mention here.

Rom. 3, 23: "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." Since all have sinned, all men by nature are lost and condemned creatures. But "the Son of Man is come to save that which was lost," Matt. 18, 11. Since all men by nature are lost, Christ has saved all without exception. This truth Scripture reiterates again and again. "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world," John 1, 29. He taketh away the sin of the world, *i. e.*, of all men. "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world," 1 John 2, 2. Christ has even bought them that deny Him, 2 Pet. 2, 1. So whosoever is now lost is lost of his own fault. In answer to the question, "Whom has Christ redeemed?" we confess: "Me, and all lost and damned sinners." (Cf. Mezger, *Entwuerfe*, p. 136.)

Springfield, Ill.

L. WESSEL.

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XV.

JULY, 1911.

No. 3.

WALTHER THE LUTHERAN.

(Continued.)

September 1, 1844, deserves to be recorded as one of the great days in the history of the American Lutheran Church. On that day Walther began the publication of *Der Lutheraner*. The very name chosen for this famous periodical, with the time-honored motto underneath, "God's Word and Luther's doctrine pure shall now and evermore endure," was significant. It came as a confession and a challenge. It fairly compelled notice. Here was a writer who had the courage of his convictions and proposed to speak them.

Walther explains his reasons for publishing the periodical, and the prospective aims and contents of his paper, in the prefatory article.

It is plain that the German population of Western America is daily increasing. In proportion to its growth the number of those is increasing who profess the faith which Luther in his day preached to the Germans. However, no church organization in our country beholds its members in such an orphaned condition as the Evangelical Lutheran. Possibly there are many here who still call themselves Lutheran; but they live scattered, and, as a rule, are destitute of means to such an extent, that in many places they are scarcely able to organize congregations, and to appoint a minister of their confession to serve them. Accordingly, the German Lutherans in our country are in no small temptation to forsake the faith of their fathers: they will either cast off all regard for the church, divine worship, etc., or they will seek to have their religious needs satisfied in other religious organizations already existing in this country. Hence, our dear brethren in the faith in this part of our

adopted country are, indeed, in need of encouragement to remain faithful to their confession. They need to be warned against the dangers of defection with which they are threatened in many ways. They need weapons of defense against those who dispute the correctness of that faith which they had learned in their youth from their Catechism. They need the comforting assurance that the Church whose faith they profess has not yet disappeared, and hence, that there is no reason at all why they should seek refuge in any other religious society.

These needs, which are, no doubt, felt by many, and also the conviction that it is our duty to give to our fellow-citizens in this country an account of the faith and doctrine of our Church, and of the principles according to which we act,—these were the motives which prompted the undersigned, together with a number of his brethren in the ministry and in the faith in Missouri and Illinois, to publish a paper with the above title. This paper is to serve chiefly the following purposes: 1. It is to acquaint people with the doctrine, the treasures, and the history of the Lutheran Church. 2. It is to furnish the evidence to prove that this Church must not be grouped with the Christian sects, that it is not a new, but the old, true Church of Jesus Christ, and hence, that this Church has by no means become defunct, yea, that it never can become so, because of the promise of Christ: "Behold, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." 3. Our paper is to show how a person, as a true Lutheran, may hold the true faith, lead a Christian life, suffer patiently, and die in the faith. 4. Finally, our paper is to refute and warn against the false and deceptive teachings which are being disseminated in our days, and, in particular, it is to expose those who falsely call themselves Lutheran, and under this name are spreading false beliefs, unbelief, and the notions of enthusiasts, and thus are creating the worst prejudices against our Church among the members of other parties.

After reading the above, possibly not a few will deny our ability to achieve the end which we have proposed for ourselves. Or they may become fearful lest our paper will breathe the spirit of intolerance, and will feed and nourish the hatred existing between the followers of different creeds. In reply to the former scruple we have only this to say: No one, indeed, recognizes more keenly than we do ourselves, our deficiency for discharging in their full scope the functions of an editor of a Christian journal. However, we know that in divine matters useful service which a person desires to render to his brethren does not depend on great learning and eloquence, but on a true, living knowledge of the saving truth and on a plain

testimony in its behalf. Moreover, it is our intention to let the most ingenious teachers of our Church, especially Luther, speak in our paper. We believe that this feature alone will make the contents of our paper so valuable that our readers will tolerate what little we shall offer of our own productions. As regards the latter scruple, that will soon vanish after our readers shall have perused but a few pages attentively and without bias. For quite a while we ourselves were held captive in sundry errors, and God bore with us patiently, and with much long-suffering guided us into the way of truth. Mindful of this fact, we, too, intend to exercise patience toward our erring neighbors, and by the grace of God shall refrain from all sinful judging and condemning of others. We shall attack errors rather than the persons of the erring. Nor do we intend to parade ourselves as persons who alone are Lutherans and who alone possess the truth; but we merely desire to testify that God has done great things for us, and has guided us to the living knowledge of the alone-saving truth. (Vol. I, p. 1.)

Such was Walther's program, and this program was strictly carried out, though with results far different and far greater than Walther had anticipated. We shall take a brief survey of Walther's editorial activity during the first year. According to promise, Luther becomes Walther's leading contributor. With a masterly insight into the needs of the times he reproduces the classical deliverances of the Reformer on vital points of the Christian faith, now in a brief saying, now in a copious extract. These citations are not the conventional material with which the perplexed editor fills *lacunae* in his paper; they seem to have been written for the day and the hour. Down the centuries rings the voice of Luther, and his followers in America surely must have marveled how apt, how pertinent his remarks proved still after the lapse of three hundred years.

Among the serial articles in this volume three, in particular, deserve especial mention. First the article on the name "Lutheran." With the utmost sincerity Walther in this article discusses the questions: Is it wrong to be called Lutheran? What does it mean to be a Lutheran? Why do we insist on retaining our Lutheran name? The writer bares to his readers his full confessional consciousness, his love and fidelity to the Lutheran Church. Spurning with his whole heart the possible

imputation of man-worship, which is so readily raised against the bearers of the name "Lutheran," Walther loyally accepts the name, as he accepts the name "Christian," both names being to him equal in origin, equal in meaning, equal in destiny. Whatever there still was of the Lutheran conscience in America must have felt itself powerfully stimulated by this earnest presentation of the Lutheran's right to exist and to perpetuate the faith of his Church.

The second serial article Walther secured from his friend Keyl in Altenburg. It was a Life of Luther, written in a lively and popular style, and accentuating step for step the divine mission of the Reformer. It is well known that Christian biographies find no readers more grateful than Christian laymen. In Keyl's compact delineation of the Reformer's character and narration of the important events in his life the Lutheran laymen beheld the chosen instrument of God, rugged, artless, plain, mighty in word and deed, with an absorbing passion for the truth of God's Word, urging, warning, cheering his colaborers, full of strife within and without, and, withal, humble and trustful. It was not a mere lesson in church history, but a lesson in practical Christianity which this Life of Luther conveyed to its readers.

As to the third serial article one wavers whether to mention the Contributions for the Defense of the Christian Religion against the Ordinary Objections Raised by the Scoffers and Blasphemers of our Day, or Loeber's articles on Arius, or Brohm's treatise on the Call to the Ministry. The first two are ably written articles, exhibiting the lines of defense which the Church must ever adopt against grosser heresies. But the Lutheran tendency of the paper is most strikingly maintained in the last article, which attacked a crying evil in the American Lutheran Church, the temporary call to the ministry.

Walther had promised his readers weapons of defense against assailants of the Lutheran Church. He had probably not anticipated that he would be called upon so speedily and so frequently to furnish these. His paper had reached the sixth

issue, when it had to take notice of an attack by a Romanist, Editor Oertel, who challenged Walther's statements in the second issue regarding the infallible marks of the Church, the Word of God and the sacraments. In Walther's reply to this opponent we obtain the first glimpse of the spirit and method of his argument in a polemical effort. Because of its intrinsic value we reproduce a portion of the argument:—

It remains, in the first place, to reply to the objection that the aforementioned marks cannot be true marks, because heterodox people, too, appeal to them. We reply: True, all sects boast that they have the true doctrine; does that prove anything? Does Mr. Oertel consider possessing and claiming that you possess the same thing? Did not the heretical Donatists boast that they were the Catholic Church, and are not the Greek congregations still boasting their apostolicity just as much as the Roman Church, which is determined in excluding the Greeks from its communion? Does the real possessor of a matter cease to be the possessor for the reason that some person delirious with fever imagines that he is the possessor? If only such things to which no one could set up a false claim are to be true marks, what possible marks could there be? Can you fix a limit to the arrogance of a lot of enthusiasts?—We claim, on the contrary, that for this very reason because *all* assert: We have these marks! our mention of these marks is not false, but this is rather a proof that they are the *true* marks. All sects know quite well that they can pass for the society of true disciples of Christ only on condition that they abide by the Word and ordinances of Christ; that is the reason why they are so bold to set up this claim and to repeat it after the true Church. The *false* prophet knows that the *true* prophet is recognized by his pure, divine teaching; for that reason the false prophet pretends such teaching. How now? Will the true prophet on that account fail to be recognized as such by his true doctrine? That would be a fine argument!—Accordingly, Augustine in his controversy with the Donatists writes: "There are divine books whose authority is not controverted among us; either side believes in them and submits to them. On this common territory let us seek the Church, and discuss our affair." (*Lib. de Unit. Eccl.*, c. 3.) The same author writes: "All heretics try to defend their false and deceptive opinions by means of the Scripture; but it is just by the perfectly clear and unanimous sentence of the divine testimonies that they stand condemned." (*Lib. 3, De Trin.*, c. 3.)

Granted, says Mr. Oertel; but in that case "the very point in controversy is made the basis and the criterion of the Christian faith while every scientific argument must be built up on certain and incontrovertible principles, if the entire system is not to be exposed as untenable." If Mr. Oertel ever uttered an unchristian thought, it is this. For his statement is a blasphemy, and charges God with having given us a dark, uncertain, vacillating Word, on which no one can take a firm stand, to which no one can confidently appeal in defiance of the whole world, and spurning all human notions. Alas! poor world, deserving of pity; for in that case even *God* should have deceived thee! He should have given thee an anchor that could not secure thee when thou art storm-swept and tempest-tossed! He would have directed thee to an *ignis fatuus* which thou couldst follow only hesitatingly, uncertain whether it would guide thee to high and dry ground, or tempt thee into an abyss! But can this claim stand, that the true doctrine must be untenable ground, because the sects question and oppose it? Must the Bible really be nothing but a nose of wax, because enthusiasts treat it as such, twisting it to suit their fancy? Must God's Word lack all argumentative force because men misuse and pervert it? Is it not awful to have to listen to such claims? Verily, such talk can only come from one of those unfortunates who coveted to drink from the intoxicating cup of the Antichrist,—only a papist who regards nothing, not even God's Word, as certain, unless it be stamped with the approval of the pope and the bishops. My poor, deluded friend, your statements are not the voice of the true Church. The Church does not consider the revelations of Scripture debatable matters; she says with David: "Thy Word is a light unto my feet and a lamp unto my way" (Ps. 119); and with Peter: "We have a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts;" and with Isaiah: "To the Law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." (Is. 8, 20.) We Lutherans do not take the least notice of the multiform faith of all sects of enthusiasts. The awful confusion of these last times does not disturb us in the least. We do not by any means attribute it to the obscurity of the Scriptures, or to the liberty of private interpretation of the Scriptures, but to the perverseness, blindness, and malice of men who will not simply and unconditionally submit to the testimony of Scripture, but attempt to correct the Holy Spirit according to the strange fancies of their corrupt reason or according to the sickly sentiments of their perverse heart. Let the sects, then,

continue to controvert and question the true doctrine, what is that to us Lutherans? Let others doubt and feel uncertain, waver and vacillate,—you cannot expect anything else where false doctrine reigns. We, however, are certain; for we know that the Word of God cannot deceive us; it affords a safe *hold* and a good *foundation*.

But Mr. Oertel will raise the objection: Who is to be judge in this matter? Who will show us the true meaning of Scripture? We reply: No one but Scripture itself; the Scriptures are self-explanatory. It is vain to say to us Lutherans: "Thus saith the Church; woe to him who will not listen!" We answer: Whenever we hear from your mouth what the Word of God says, whenever you prove your statements from Scripture,—very well! In that case we are hearing the Church, and we wish to be obedient sons of our mother. But whenever we hear a strange doctrine, we remember the word of our Lord: "Beware of false prophets!" And we say to you: Hush your ceaseless appeals to the Church! You are not the Church; it is not Christ, but the spirit of lies that speaks through you. Yea, we assert that a church which demands obedience, without offering Scripture proof for its claims, is not the Church of Christ, but the tyrannical church of the devil; for his custom it is to set himself up above God and His Word. Woe to the person who obeys such a church; she will lead him into eternal death!

The question is being asked, How can a layman find his way out of the maze of the different doctrines of the sects? How is he to decide which side has the truth? Is it not necessary for him to first find the Church to which he can entrust himself to be guided blindfolded, without fear of being misled? Thus only he can speak who does not know what *faith* is; for true faith may not be built on any man, no matter how holy or wise he is, or what exalted official position in the Church he may occupy. Even the humblest layman is in a state of true faith only when he knows and clings to this fact: Thus it is written; thus saith God; such are the promises of the faithful and truthful God of heaven.

It is, indeed, true that it is no easy matter, especially in these last sad times, to discover the true Church by means of the pure Word and the sacraments, inasmuch as so many sects are arising that surround themselves with the halo of Christian teaching and brilliant sanctity. But we point once more to the saying quoted before: "He layeth up sound wisdom for the righteous" ("den Auf-richtigen laesst Er's gelingen," Prov. 2, 7). The Scriptures are clear in every point that concerns our salvation; let everyone who is trying to find the true Church grasp this touchstone, and humbly

call upon God for the guidance of His Holy Spirit, and he will soon find that society which assuredly has Jesus with all the treasures of His grace in its midst, because it clings to His Word and His unadulterated sacraments. It is a blessed mark of abiding honor in the Bereans that, even when Paul preached to them, they "searched the Scripture daily, whether those things were so." (Acts 17, 11.) They are a glorious example, by which all should be guided who are trying to find the true Church, and would not like to be deceived by a false church: they tried to discover agreement of the doctrine with the Scriptures, and when they found that, they gladly joined the new congregation of Christians.

True, natural man would prefer to have marks of the Church on which he could lay his hands even while sleeping, as it were; and we do not deny that the marks of the true Church, which *Der Lutheraner* has mentioned are not very convenient for the carnally sluggish mind of a person who is spiritually dead and blind. It is true that to find the pearl of truth entails labor and conflict; but, dear reader, this pearl is worth seeking for and digging for day and night, for it brings peace to the soul and the certainty of your eternal salvation. For this reason, however, you should not feel surprised that at this very time the Lutheran Church has the most faithless sons, that this particular Church is now the smallest, most despised, and most divided. Remember, the Lutheran Church must be known by the truth; however, it is now midnight throughout the world; love of the truth is almost utterly extinct; truth is considered the vilest merchandise: there is no demand for it, much less is there any serious intention to investigate the truth. Even those who still profess to believe the Bible consider purity of doctrine a chimera, and they regard it as inopportune and as an intolerable Lutheran stubbornness to insist on, or to esteem very highly, any article of our faith. Why, matters *had to* come to such a pass in times such as the Lord had in mind when He said: "When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?"

However, my beloved Lutheran Christian, though many at your right and at your left fall from the truth, let this be all the more reason for you to take a firm stand. Remember, the reason why many did not know Christ in the days of His flesh was, because He did not reveal Himself to the world by some outward token of splendor. The world desired Him to be an earthly king, and the world to-day desires His Church to be a visible and magnificent kingdom; that is the reason why the world of to-day cannot know the Church, because, like its Head, the Church is disfigured by the cross. Oh, let no one beguile you of your reward! Cling to this

truth, *viz.*, that the true Church is known by the pure Word and the sacraments. Grasp this sword firmly, and you will never be tempted to forsake your Church. You will continue to make it your habitation, even if it should grow still smaller, even if it should become as the stable at Bethlehem, as a cottage in a vineyard, as a lodge in a garden of cucumbers. (Is. 1, 8.) It sufficeth that God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved. All the glittering domes which human ingenuity has reared shall fall; but even the gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church. Hallelujah! (I, 23 f.)

This entire passage fairly throbs with fervid zeal for the cause of the poor, humiliated, and deserted Lutheran Church, and the whole pathos of the situation in which Walther's labors were begun rushes in on one's mind as one follows his reasoning and his pleading. We behold here the touch of the master of popular debate, — keen logic, apt repartee, the dreaded *reductio ad absurdum*; and from the discomfiture of his opponent the polemist proceeds to constructive efforts, and his great heart swells with touching, cordial affection for his brethren. There is a yearning note in his peroration; it lifts one up and rouses holy resolves and aspirations, and it rings out in a triumphant shout of victory.

Editor Oertel figures once more in the animadversions of Walther in this volume. Walther exhibits the notorious insincerity of Roman polemist in an article of March 8, 1845, and concludes his remarks with the following interesting statement:—

By the way, we must decline with most profound thanks the overtures made to us repeatedly and in no uncertain terms to unite with Mr. Oertel and his ilk in fighting those Protestants which we, too, regard as heterodox. In fighting the Methodists, Neo-Lutherans, etc., Mr. Oertel engages in coarse, cruel, unloving calumnies, void of ingenuity and conscience; we have absolutely nothing to do with him. We still know how to distinguish between those who are unwittingly misled by their own hearts, and those who—the Lord knows for what reasons!—endeavor knowingly and with intent to keep and confirm the poor people in superstition, idolatry, and denial of the only valid merit of Jesus Christ, the only Mediator between God and men. (I, 5.)

Transcontinental reminiscences of a spiritual misery from which Walther and the Saxon emigrants had fled when they quitted Germany, appear in a number of articles, most of them serial, against "the Evangelical Church in North America." This body was an undisguised reproduction of the German state-church, that hybrid product of a Hohenzollern king and his hireling counselors, which has fused the Lutheran and the Reformed churches of Germany into a nondescript something that is—confessionally—neither fish nor fowl, and has raised confessional doubt and cowardice to the dignity of a virtue. Walther's far-seeing judgment is discerned in the resolute stand which he took as soon as he was aware of the purpose of this European importation. In his criticism of this organization Walther exposes the evils of syncretism, and, in so doing, arrays himself openly against the spirit of the age and the typical unionism rampant in the Protestant churches of America. He says:—

If this union were a consolidation of churches that is based on a common faith and on a common acceptance of the truth,—if it were brought about by those who formerly were in error, acknowledging and renouncing their error and accepting the truth, no one, indeed, could be a Christian who would not with his whole heart wish these men the best success in their endeavor, and who would not be ready to unite with them and, if need be, to sacrifice with the utmost gladness his chattels and his life for the attainment of such a holy purpose? Aye, perish the hand that would dare to take up the pen to write against such a pious undertaking! For that would indicate envy in the writer,—envy of the honor due God, and envy of the salvation that is to come to souls dearly bought. For our part, we can state thruthfully that we deeply mourn the divisions of Christendom, that we have no pleasure in strifes and quarrels, and that we are beseeching the Lord every day that He would put a stop to the schisms among Christians which are daily increasing, and unite all who have become divided, in truth and peace.

We see, however, from the paragraph quoted that the Evangelical Society in the Western part of our country has an altogether different purpose and character. This Society does not intend to effect a union between Lutherans and Reformed that is based on agreement in faith, but it desires its members to regard each other as belonging to one and the same church, although they hold entirely

different beliefs with regard to the most important articles of the Christian doctrine.

We can never advocate such a union with a good conscience; on the contrary, we must protest against it with the utmost emphasis and determination, and must earnestly warn our Lutheran brethren in particular against this union. We are far from condemning the entire Reformed Church on account of the errors which we behold clearly established against this Church. We are rather firmly convinced that also this Church has many dear children of God in its midst. Accordingly, we are gladly willing to maintain our existence alongside of the Reformed Church in Christian love; but it is contrary to our conscience, because it is contrary to the Word of God, to enter into ecclesiastical union with this body, as long as it clings to the errors of the Reformed Church. The command of the Lord, given to the Church through the apostle, 1 Cor. 1, 10, is clear: "I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak *the same* thing, and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together in *the same mind and in the same judgment.*" Here we have an incontrovertible command of God, to the effect, that in a true Christian Church there must not be various minds, but *one mind* in regard to the doctrines that have been clearly revealed by God; yea, that the members of the true Church must not only be one as regards the faith in their *hearts*, but they must also reveal their unity in the Spirit and in faith by professing their doctrine in *the same terms*. Again, the same apostle says: "I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses *contrary to the doctrine* which ye have learned; *and avoid them!*" Rom. 16, 17. Here we are told that the chief division against which God warns the Church is a *division caused by contrary, false doctrine*; and on the other hand, that it is right, and commanded by God, to *avoid* those, or to separate also externally from those who have already become separate from us in their hearts by embracing a contrary doctrine. Accordingly, neither can a Reformed, who holds God's Word to be true and still believes the teaching of his Church to be correct, unite in a church-union with a Lutheran, nor the orthodox Lutheran with the Reformed. If the Lutheran unites with those whom he regards as errorists, he breaks his baptismal vow, he actually denies the faith which he solemnly professed at his confirmation, he perjures himself, and falls away from his Church.

Accordingly, the symbolical writings of the Evangelical Lutheran Church state in entire accord with the Word of God: "To dissent from the agreement of so many nations and to be called

schismatics is a serious matter. But divine authority commands all not to be allies and defenders of impiety." (*Sm. Art.*, Append. 42, p. 346.) Again, in the Tenth Article of the *Form of Concord* we find this teaching, *viz.*, that we cannot, without denying the truth, unite with the adversaries of our faith even in external ceremonies and in indifferent matters, unless we "*are first agreed with them in doctrine.*" In the same place we find the following: "When such ceremonies are designed for the purpose, and therefore are required and received, as though by and through them two contrary religions were reconciled and became one body; or again, when an advance towards the Papacy and a departure from the pure doctrine of the Gospel and true religion should occur or gradually follow therefrom, — in this case what Paul writes must have weight: 'Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers! What communion hath light with darkness? Wherefore, come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord!' 2 Cor. 6, 14. 17." (*Sol. Decl.*, Art. 10, 5. 6, p. 644.) From this passage of the public Confessions of our Church the Christian reader can see that our Church, agreeably to the divine command, has long ago decidedly rejected such a union by which two churches, prior to their agreeing in the true doctrine, are to be welded into one body or unit.

There are two reasons, in particular, why we consider it our sacred duty to bear witness in all seriousness against the design to spread the united, or so-called Evangelical Church also in our country. Our first reason is, because this Church must in our country gather its converts in the majority of cases from the Lutheran Church. In order that the new Evangelical Church may subsist, our beloved coreligionists before others will have to be induced to forsake their faith and their Church, and enlist with this new body. Accordingly, we must regard this Church as our most dangerous opponent, — an equal menace to us with the German Methodist Church, which also lives by raiding other churches and by the faithlessness of their members. The Evangelical Church does not do either of two things: it does not proceed on its way quietly alongside of us, and it does not meet us in a decisive battle like other churches; it spreads its nets and sets its traps right in our own camp; it often robs our Church of its best sons and daughters: it makes them indifferent to pure teaching, quenches the confessional spirit in them, and thus renders them inactive in that united struggle in behalf of the treasure of the undiminished truth which is necessary in our times.

Another reason that moves us just on this occasion not to hold our peace, but to publicly raise our feeble voice is, because we are

convinced that this Society, though its beginnings have been small, threatens to become exceedingly pernicious to the permanent existence of our Church, especially in these Western parts. For this reason we believe that we owe it our brethren to warn them, not to despise the phenomenon of the rise of this Society as unimportant, but to rouse themselves and remember that on the Last Day we shall have to give an account of the precious treasure of the pure doctrine, gained by our faithful forefathers in many a severe conflict and frequently at the sacrifice of their possessions and their life,—transmitted to us, and then lost through our security, lethargy, and indifference. (I, 43 f.)

In the three issues following, Walther takes up and dissects the four reasons which the "Evangelical Church Society in the West" had offered in defense of the unionism to which it was committed. He shows the Society's misapplication of John 10, 16, and Rom. 16, 17, and the misleading claims of successes already achieved which the Society had advanced. He discusses such points as these: What constitutes the Church, the difference between the Church invisible and visible, the origin of sects, the means of maintaining and purifying the Church, etc.? All these points were elucidated still more when the Evangelical Society, through Rev. Nollau, replied to Walther's criticism in a brochure entitled: "A Word for the Cause of Union." In his review of this brochure Walther states where it can be purchased: evidently his intention was that the readers of *Der Lutheraner* should read it and judge for themselves. Walther's review abounds in masterful refutations of the sophisms of unionism. We would like to reproduce them, because such arguments never lose their value and might be applied with telling force in our own day. But our paper has been growing beyond the size which we had intended. For this reason we prefer to cull from Walther's reply to Nollau only one passage, which exhibits the remarkable candor and humility of Walther in his polemics. Nollau had indulged in insinuations, hinting that the spirit of Stephan had reappeared in Walther. Walther replies:—

Mr. N. has cast up to us the grave offenses of which we became guilty as Stephanists, or followers of the notorious Stephan. We

declare that every reminder of the offense which we have caused in both hemispheres is very salutary to us, because it is good for us to be deeply humiliated in the eyes of God and men. Accordingly, we declare that our bitterest *enemies have benefited us more* than our friends who would charitably cover all our sins. Moreover, we declare most sincerely that we are not angry at Mr. N., because in a public writing he has renewed the memory of our past errors, to our great confusion before the whole world. On the contrary, we seize this opportunity to publicly and humbly confess once more how deeply we feel the burden of our guilt. We confess that, while we were followers of Stephan, we blindly put our trust in a poor erring man, and without serious examination by the rule of God's Word allowed ourselves to be guided by him. We confess that we had made the ministers rulers over their congregations; we confounded secular and spiritual interests; we viewed the Church as bound up in a visible society; we passed uncharitable judgments on Germany and many of its inhabitants who are children of God; we ruthlessly denied that many who were erring were in a state of grace and would be saved; we separated from our brethren after the manner of sects; in a fanatical delusion we abandoned our calling and our native land without urgent cause, and in so doing severed most sacred ties; we honored the Confessions of our Church with our lips, but were not faithful guardians of the doctrine contained in them; we called ourselves Lutherans, while our doctrine and practice in many respects were utterly un-Lutheran; to be brief, by the pretense of genuine Lutheranism we allowed ourselves to be carried headlong into conditions into which only religious fanaticism can lead men; hence, we were on the point of becoming a most pernicious sect. However, we also confess that we are heartily sorry for all these great and grave offenses; we do not consider ourselves worthy to be called disciples, servants of Christ, and Lutherans; yea, we apply to the times when Stephanism had reached its highest development among us the words which Luther uttered when he referred to the time of his initiation into the priesthood: "It was not right (humanly speaking), and we owe it to the overweening long-suffering of God, that the earth did not swallow us up at the time." We are now wondering, especially the preachers among us and all the leaders of our late emigration, why the ocean did not swallow us up. We are heart-broken when we reflect how grievously we have insulted and provoked God, and have caused the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme; when we reflect that probably not a few souls were mortally offended at us, a horrible blotch was affixed to the entire Church of Jesus Christ, and all believing children of

God who saw us proceed on error's path were deeply grieved and saddened by us. Once more, therefore, we ask all whom we have offended in the past to pardon our grave offenses for God's sake, and to attribute what we did in our blindness, not to the Word of God, not to the Lutheran Church, not to strict and firm adherence to the truth, but only to our perverseness and faithlessness.

However, while publicly repeating this confession and acknowledgment, we do not by any means intend to deny the grace of God which has been accorded us, etc. (I, 79.)

Any person engaging in censorial work before the public has need of a large measure of self-scrutiny, self-control, and the ability of objective reasoning. An honest critic feels his heart sink when things which he must attack in others are found on his own side, and the *Tu quoque* argument in a debate not infrequently renders the finest attack abortive. In Walther's polemics there is manifest the grace of sincerity, which always cooperated with his passionate love of the truth. There is also manifest the courage and confidence of faith in the divine grace which does not permit a confessor's mouth to become tongue-tied by the recollection of his past errors, yea, which is pleased to employ those who had been erring as guides, after their recovery, to others who are still in error. It was this belief, no doubt, that supported Walther in several trying episodes in his first years as editor; it made him cheerful where others would have been filled with dismay and unnerved.

(*To be concluded.*)

DR. MARTIN LUTHER'S TREATISE OF CONFESSION, WHETHER THE POPE HAVE POWER TO ENJOIN SAME.

(*Concluded.*)

113. XXI. And why should we feel ashamed to unbosom ourselves to a mere man, when at our death—a short time hence—we shall be obliged to stand shamefaced before God and all angels and devils?—all of which we could easily avoid

by suffering a little embarrassment before one man. I am not sure that a man may have a real, living faith if he refuses to suffer so much as to embarrass himself before another. Each Christian must bear his cross, if he is to be saved and his faith to be tried, and this shame is a very small part of the holy cross. No suffering here is a bearing of the cross, except the shame and disgrace that we (as Christ) be numbered with the transgressors.

114. For I reject the laws of the pope concerning confession on account of those that are unwilling to bear this cross, and are not susceptible to the inducements. With these he ought to cease from urging, and not drive them into additional sins. They are all thieves, crucified on the left hand of Christ, and suffer in vain; nay, they only add to their sins, even as that thief did [Luke 23, 39]. We are to invite, not to drive; to call, not to force; to strengthen, not to threaten; to console, not to terrify with confession and all other sufferings. We are to teach and make men free, free, willing, and eager to confess; if we cannot do this, we must not undertake to command and force. For just as to torture, suffering, and death we can only invite, call, strengthen, and console. If anyone is unwilling or unable to do this, let him cease from threatening, driving, and terrifying. We are far too prone to threaten and compel.

115. XXII. The second reason and inducement that ought to make us willing to confess our sins is the noble and precious promise of God contained in the following four passages: Matt. 16, 19: "Whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Matt. 18, 18: "Whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." John 20, 23: "Whosoever sins ye remit, they shall be remitted unto them." Matt. 18, 19. 20: "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." If a man is not moved by such words full

of love and comfort, he must, indeed, have a frigid faith and be a poor sort of a Christian.

116. For although each one may confess his sins to God privately, and may secretly make his peace with God, still he has no one to render a verdict upon him in which he may acquiesce and gain peace of conscience. He cannot help but worry as to whether he has met all requirements or not. But it is a fine and sure course to lay hold of God in His own words and promises, so that we may gain a firm foothold and a proud reliance on the truth of God, and thus urge freely and boldly upon God Himself His own truth and say: Now, dear God, I have in Thy sight complained of my sin to my neighbor and revealed it unto him and have joined with him in Thy name and desired grace. Thou hast out of abundant grace promised: Whatsoever is bound shall be bound, and whatsoever is loosed shall be loosed, and shall be done of the Father what we agree to ask. Therefore I cling to Thy promise, and do not doubt Thy truthful promise, that, as my neighbor has loosed me in Thy name, so shall I be loosed, and that unto me shall be done as we have asked.

117. XXIII. Behold, he that confesses only to God in secret cannot have such a defiant assurance, for these promises are given unto two or three, or as many as there may be. But God is faithful, and whatever He promises we are sure He will perform [Ps. 33, 4], as St. Paul says unto Timothy [2 Ep. 2, 13]: "If we believe not, yet He abideth faithful: He cannot deny Himself." Therefore, this faithfulness of God in regard to His promises is an abundant, precious, rich, and firm assurance, which will let no man sink and remain in doubt.

118. Such a man will maintain himself against all the powers of heaven and hell and earth, and God Himself will yield unto him and concede Himself overcome, as it is taught figuratively Gen. 32, where Jacob wrestled with the Angel and fought all night, till morning. Scripture says that Jacob prevailed against God, and that the Angel was not able to

deny him anything. For this same reason the Angel changed his name and called him Israel, meaning: a prince of God or one prevailing against God, and gave His reason in these words: "Thy name shall be called Israel," a conqueror of God; for if thou hast prevailed against God, how much more wilt thou prevail against men.

119. Thus we all must be Israelites, and acquire power over God. This can be accomplished in only one way: God's judgment and our conscience are bitter enemies; God's judgment is righteous, our conscience, sinful and deserving of punishment. When these two meet, a deathly struggle and the anguish of hell begins; there is hard wrestling and heavy fighting. If our conscience is to prevail there and become an Israel, it must lay hold of God where He may be conquered and captured. This can be done by laying hold of Him in His promises, to which our conscience must cling so firmly and so long till judgment is compelled to desist and promised grace alone remains. Then our conscience is made glad, and God becomes what man desires. For He cannot lie, and is thus conquered by His own truth as He has graciously promised in advance.

120. XXIV. For this reason the words immediately following tell us that the Angel blessed Jacob, and Jacob said [Gen. 32, 30]: "I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved." What does he mean? This, that his soul has been in dire distress and anguish and has felt God's judgment as being incensed at him. But what did he do? He had in times before received a gracious promise of God that He would be his God and that He would bless in his seed all the families of the earth [Gen. 28, 13, 14]. To the truth of this he clings so firmly, would not think of God in any other way, and would have suffered himself to be torn into a hundred thousand pieces rather than surrender his belief that God, having given him this gracious promise, would fulfill it and prove faithful. And thus he gained the victory, and is called a man who has prevailed against God, that is, Israel. Of this Hosea says,

12, 4. 5: "By his strength he had power with God. Yea, he had power over the Angel, and prevailed; he wept, and made supplication unto Him," etc.

121. Thus he became Israel, a man having power over God, while before he was Jacob (one who treads all sin under foot), that is, he has become a free man, who has power over God and sin, hell and heaven. Thus we also must conquer God with God, and urge Him upon Himself, a battle in which our strength is nothing else than His divine promise and truth, which He cannot deny and will not. Thus, if a man lay hold of Him there, he has Him and will hold Him. This is confessed by the bride in the Song of Solomon, 3, 1—4, when she had sought Him a long time and had not found Him. When she had passed but a little from the watchmen, she found Him and said, "I hold Him, and will not let Him go." If, now, a man makes light of this wealth of divine truth, although he may so easily obtain it in confession, he surely shows that he does not esteem God's grace highly. As far as he is concerned, this bounteous market-place has been opened in vain, and it is to be feared that his faith is not genuine and will not endure to the end.

122. XXV. But is it not true that, if any man knew that such a promise as that given to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob existed, no matter where on earth, we would have no peace and would risk our life and our worldly goods to obtain it? Well, now God has filled all the world with such promises in the Gospel. For what He has promised unto them, He says unto us and unto all the world in the passages cited above, Matt. 18, 18 sqq. We have it at our neighbors, before the door of our house, and yet refuse to receive it. The holy patriarchs esteemed it so highly and clung to it so firmly, and we regard it so lightly that we refuse to take upon ourselves a little mortification before one man to obtain it. Verily, it is a shameful lack of faith and an ungrateful contempt of the kind promises of divine grace and comfort.

123. It is by reason of this ingratitude that God has

plagued us with the pope and his accursed laws, and has imposed this penalty, that we are compelled to run after his lying bulls and deceitful indulgences and to purchase this iniquity of his at great cost. It serves us right: we do not recognize the bounteous and true promise of God; we have not received it gladly and willingly, without cost and labor, and now we must buy mere lies of the devil through the pope at high cost and great labor, instead of the truth. St. Paul, 2 Thess. 2, 11. 10, has foretold this: "God shall send them strong delusion, because they believed not the truth, and received not the love of truth, that they might be saved."

124. XXVI. But where there is genuine contrition, there is not much need of urging and admonishing. And particularly in the anguish of death a sinner's eyes are opened, and he becomes eager and glad that such an opportunity is offered him to confess his sins and to hear such a comforting promise. In such a frame of mind he would give his life many times rather than do without this advantage.

125. Why, then, do we not bear ourselves thus at all times, and while we are in good health, since we must always look forward to that hour without any certainty? On the other hand, as was said above, to those that are not in that attitude of mind confession is of no advantage. For as yet their contrition and faith is not sufficient, and it is better for them to postpone their confession, in order that they may not dishonor God's promise and grace offered in confession, and defile it by their lack of preparation. Meanwhile they should not allow the pope's apish law to raise any doubts in their hearts, even though they were excommunicated on account of it. It is better to live under the ban of the pope, the juggler, which is of no validity, than to sin against the serious and true grace of God and His promise. And to sum it up, whosoever is a serious Christian let him thank God that he may have this confession, and let him use it with joy and gladness whenever and as often as he desires, without regard to the pope's tomfoolery and law.

126. Thus there is here no need of doing anything further than to make men willing and eager for it without command and compulsion by means of the foregoing reasoning; the profit and fruit will follow. Again, those that are not willing and are not moved by such reasons can far less be brought to it by law and compulsion; or, if they are compelled to confess and do it not from their own free will, they are driven into it merely for their own greater hurt and harm. Therefore, it is necessary in such cases not to coerce such men and to consign this unhallowed law of the pope to the privy, where it belongs, although it is not worthy of the place, because it drives so enormously many thousands of souls to their destruction in this sacrament, and makes this high boon of divine promise a laughing-stock, without any reason or ground, from sheer personal malice and frivolity.

127. XXVII. It is far better to advise such people to confess to God in secret. Without doubt, they will not in this fashion commune with God three or four times and confess to Him. At some time or other they will consider who He is to whom they are speaking and confessing and promising reform, and they will say to themselves: Pray, how often dost thou confess, how often dost thou speak to God; when wilt thou seriously mend thy ways? Thus they might, through this secret confession to God, be overcome with fear, and thereafter become free and willing to confess to man also, and thus gain God's promises. Otherwise they might perhaps never have come to this way of thinking from their feeling of reluctance and fear to confess unto man, which causes them such distress of mind that they think of nothing else than how to have it over with most quickly. Thus they remain one year as the other. They think to confess is all that is needed. They never really think of God; they are servants of custom and human laws. Away with such men from confession, and let them be instructed that they habituate themselves to confess to their God, angel, or patron saint in secret, and let them confine themselves to this until they become more willing and better.

128. XXVIII. But let us continue and comfort those of weak faith, whom the holy apostle, Rom. 15, 1; 14, 1, commands us not to despise, but to receive, and let us further show them how free this confession is. The pope, in his misleading laws, has strained the thing to such a narrow compass that he bids us confess all sins and only to the priest. This you must not do, unless you do it gladly; and here bear in mind your three liberties.

129. The first liberty is, that you do not resolve to confess all sins, but only those that bite and oppress your conscience, while all the others you may include by acknowledging the sinfulness of your entire life, in order that the confession may be short. I mean thus: Behold, my lord, this have I done and also this, and many things more which I need not relate; but these are the greatest sins. I ask of you good comfort and counsel, for all my life is evil. By what authority would pope or man force us to recount all sins separately, since God does not require it?

130. The second liberty is this: They have made a great deal of twaddle concerning the division of confession. I, for my part, think that no one will gratuitously divide his confession if he comes at all willingly. But if he should forget something, he is under no obligation to go to the same confessor; he may either not confess it at all, or confess it to whom he will; for concerning this there is no law one way or the other. But as to those that confess unwillingly, merely from fear of the pope's law, what difference does it make whether they divide their confession or not, a confession which it would have been better to drop entirely? For it is of no avail and is lost labor, moreover harmful to the soul. It is a confession which God does not hear; it is made merely to the pope. Therefore, as the confessor is, such is the confessant, such also the absolution, except that the Word of God is therein prostituted and abused. Hence let them divide or not, it makes no difference.

131. XXIX. The third liberty: If you should prefer not to confess to a priest or monk, then go to a man, either a layman or a clergyman, in whom you have confidence, and act precisely as if you desired to get good advice and comfort for your soul. Wait and see what God will say to you through him. And as he tells you in the name of the Lord, so follow him and regard it as an absolution. Cling to it and seek no other absolution! Of course, priests ought to be such people of whom every one expects good comfort and counsel in such matters, but their lust of power tickles them so very much that no one trusts them and confesses to them only from a fear of the pope's law. Such mistrust do they create with their tyranny in that they wish to be masters, not servants, among Christians. Truly, one ought to strip them of their domination and remind them of their duties as servants, and let them see that they are not noblemen, but servants, as Christ has assigned them their duty.

132. And now, to prove that I do not say this out of my own head, let us hear Christ Himself, when He says in the words cited above, Matt. 18, 15: "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone. If he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother." Listen here to the highest Pope and Judge. He says: a brother is gained if he takes advice and acknowledges his sins secretly between himself and his neighbor alone. If he is gained, everything has been made straight, and the sin disappears secretly between these two alone; what more need has he of confession? Christ Himself absolves him here with nothing more than this that he listen to his brother, and that the two compose the matter between them. We have here neither priest nor pope, and yet the brother is gained and sin is forgiven.

133. XXX. How much more will it be the case if I myself anticipate the thing and rebuke myself before my neighbor and desire of him counsel and comfort. Do you think, if I have here Christ's word and absolution, that the fear lest the pope might not absolve me should cause me any worry, seeing

that he has not an iota of Scripture for his secret confession, while I have here such a strong declaration of Christ on my side? On the contrary, we must conclude that secret confession, punishment, and reformation is taken away from the priests and is given to every one in the congregation. For Christ says here not to Peter, nor any individual, but generally, to every one, "Go and tell thy brother his fault!" Hence every Christian is a confessor of secret confession, which the pope, the great robber, has snatched, just as he has snatched the keys, the episcopate, and everything else.

134. My friend, if Christ judges and says that the brother has been gained, though it has been done secretly, do not hesitate to accept it. He will not lie to you. If he is gained, sin is done away with and grace has come; what more do you desire? Additional aid is found in the following verse [v. 20]: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Is He in the midst of them for any other purpose than to accept and ratify what they do? Why, it is Christ Himself that does it all! Pray, why do we argue further, since we have here His clear word that everything is right and proper whatsoever thus is done in His name between brother and brother? Whence comes that foreign obligation that the pope claims in this matter? And why does he claim the right to have a hand in this secret "midst"? Yea, he is not satisfied with what Christ is satisfied with, but rides rough-shod over Christ and compels men to reveal this secret thing to him and his. Thus he destroys secret Christian confession, and inaugurates a popish and human secret confession without any cause or reason.

135. XXXI. Just as strong and even stronger are these words of Christ [v. 19]: "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven." I ween, here He seizes the pope by the jaw and tears his cobweb laws to pieces. He says quite generally, "If two of you," not the pope and a layman, a priest and a citizen, a monk and a peasant; but

two, whosoever they be, if only they be among you, that is, if they be Christians and on earth, so that no one may make bold to loose the dead in purgatory or hell, as the pope does. And, "Anything that they shall ask," etc. Here He speaks without reserve, making no exception, doubtlessly including also the sins that are discussed between brother and brother, in short, all things. And now hear His judgment and final word, "It shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven." Behold, what more do you desire, what stronger assurance? Christ is there; the Father hears, if even as few as two gather in Christ's name and pray for what they desire and need. Therefore, in view of His clear words, let us freely and gladly make bold to confess to each other, advise, help, and pray for whatever weighs upon our hearts in secret, whether it be sin or pain, and let us by no means doubt this easy and clear promise of God, and on the strength of it let us go freely and gladly to communion and die with far greater assurance than the pope's secret confession can give us, for the latter has no foundation, while here we have a strong foundation.

136. I even go further and warn men not to confess secretly to a priest, because of the priest's office, but to confess to him as to a common brother and Christian. And this in order that, since the pope's confession has no foundation, we may not build on sand, but that we may confess on the strength of these words of Christ when we do confess, whether it be to a layman or to a priest. On this let us boldly lean and comfort ourselves that, when two gather together in His name, that Christ is there, that what they do is acceptable to Him, that what they pray is done of the Father without any doubt. Assuredly we cannot gather together in Christ's name in a better manner than for the purpose of doing away with sin and to seek His grace, help, and comfort. This is most acceptable in His sight, then surely His name and honor is sought; our name and honor come to naught.

137. From all this we learn how far the pope's tyranny, as planned by the devil, has led us away from all our comfort

and salvation. And yet, as a reward, he has stolen the money and wealth and honor of all the world, as if he had done a fine thing, so that, if we had not deserved it of God, it were proper to grind him together with his devil's throne to powder. He is the real and foremost Archantichrist, whom, please God, our Lord Jesus Christ will very shortly cast into the abyss of hell by His coming. Amen.

138. Therefore let us acknowledge our guilt and bewail our ingratitude. We have not accepted gratis God's Word and grace, and hence He has given us the pope as a punishment, who sells us his lies and errors for the price of our goods, body, and life, till he has devoured our soul, body, and goods, and still devours them this very day. Let us, then, with one accord pray against this devilish stench and abomination at Rome which poisons all the world, so that God may again exalt His Word and destroy this sinful and pernicious man's law. To that end may Christ, our Lord, blessed forever, help us! Amen.

Fort Wayne, Ind.

W. H. KRUSE.

THE PROOF TEXTS OF THE CATECHISM WITH A PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.

THE SECOND ARTICLE.

(Continued.)

THE WORK OF REDEMPTION.

Gal. 3, 13: *Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us; for it is written: Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.*

The Law is good and holy. It promises eternal life on condition that it be kept perfectly: "This do, and thou shalt live." This condition, however, no man can fulfill. "We are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags." Hence the Law pronounces its curse upon us: "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which

are written in the book of the Law to do them," v. 10. We are "*under the curse of the Law.*" In ourselves there is no way of escaping this terrible curse. What we could not do Christ did for us: *He has redeemed us from this curse.* How? By "*being made a curse for us.*" Observe well the words: "*for us;*" they express the doctrine of substitution emphatically. The curse to be pronounced upon us was pronounced upon Him. He became a curse "*for us,*" *in our stead.* He took the sinner's place, "*was made under the Law,*" and satisfied its every demand. Where is the curse of the Law? Taken from us and placed upon Him. A blessed truth, full of consolation, is contained in these words: "*Christ—for us.*" He hung on a tree; that is indubitable proof that He was accursed—for us, because it is written: "*Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.*" "The chastisement of our peace was upon Him," Is. 53.¹⁾

1) Luther's famous classic on Gal. 3, 13, is worthy of prayerful meditation. Among other things he says that Christ, in our stead, is no longer "an innocent and sinless person, the Son of God born of the virgin, but a sinner, who has and bears the sin of Paul, the blasphemer and persecutor, and of Peter, the denier of his Master, and of David, the adulterer and murderer; in a word, He bears and has all the sins of all men in His body. Not that He has committed these sins, but that, being committed by us, He assumed them and transferred them to His own body, in order to render satisfaction for them with His own blood. The general law of Moses, therefore, lays hold of Him, although innocent in His own person, because it finds Him among sinners and robbers, just as a magistrate holds and punishes as guilty one whom he finds among robbers, even though he had never committed anything wrong or worthy of death. Christ, however, was not only found among sinners, but even of His own accord and by the will of the Father wished to be the associate of sinners by assuming the flesh and blood of those who, as sinners and robbers, were sunk into all sins. When the Law, therefore, found Him among robbers, it condemned and killed Him as a robber.—But some one may say, 'It is blasphemous to call the Son of God a sinner and a curse.' I answer, 'If you want to deny this, deny also that He suffered, was crucified, and died.' It is no less absurd to say that the Son of God was crucified than that He was a sinner. But if it is not absurd to confess and believe that Christ was crucified between thieves, it is not absurd to say the other. Certainly there is something in the words of Paul, '*Christ became a curse for us.*' '*He made Him to be sin for us, in order that we might be made the right-*

1 Pet. 1, 18. 19: *Ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers, but with the precious blood of Christ, as a lamb without blemish and without spot.*

Peter here addresses especially the Gentile Christians. He reminds them of their former state in which they led "*a vain conversation received by tradition from their fathers.*" Their "*conversation,*" i. e., their manner of life, was "*vain,*" empty, purposeless; it was a walk after the flesh, Eph. 2, 1. 2. 17. To the Ephesians Paul writes that they should no longer walk, as the other Gentiles do, in the *vanity* of their mind, Eph. 4, 17. This vain mode of life had been "*received by tradition from their fathers.*" The parents of such men, having themselves no true knowledge of God, could impart none to the children. Sinners can rear sinners only; what is born of the flesh is flesh. This life in the lusts of the flesh held dominion over them; they were enslaved to sin. From this dominion they could not free themselves. Christ *redeemed* them therefrom. *Redeem* means to buy back, to repurchase. A price had to be paid to release them from this terrible bondage. What was it? "*Silver and gold,*" which men deem so precious, and with which the value of all earthly things is measured, are but "*corruptible things.*" The ransom was infinitely more precious. On Calvary the "*blood of Christ*" was shed for our sins. Christ's blood was the only ransom that could buy us back from the power, the dominion, the slavery of sin. "*Precious*" this blood is because of the Person of Him who shed it, Christ—God! Not the quantity, but the quality of this

eousness of God in Him.' So John the Baptist calls Him the Lamb of God, bearing the sins of the world, John 1, 29. He Himself is innocent, because He is the Lamb of God without spot or blemish; but since He bears the sins of the world, His innocence is weighed down by the sins and guilt of the whole world. Whatever sins I and you have done have become the sins of Christ, as though He Himself had committed them. Is. 53, 6: 'The Lord hath laid upon Him the iniquity of us all.' These words we ought not to extenuate, but give them their proper force."

blood imparts to it its infinite worth. The "*lamb without blemish and without spot*," the innocent Christ, takes the place of the guilty, becomes our substitute, sheds His blood as a sacrifice, and thus atones for sin. Christians know that they were bought with a price, but they are apt to forget it, hence they must be reminded again and again: Know that ye are redeemed! He who believes that he is free from the dominion of sin, rules over sin. Know that ye are redeemed! this is the most powerful incentive for Christians to follow after sanctification. They are under obligation to do so: Christ redeemed them; they have the power to do so: Christ redeemed them.

Hebr. 2, 14. 15: *Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same, that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil, and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.*

"*Flesh and blood*," man as he is by nature, is in the power of "*him that had the power of death, that is, the devil*," hence he is also *in fear of death*, of temporal death, because back of it eternal death awaits him. To break this power and to deliver us from this fear of death, Christ took part of flesh and blood, became man like unto us, sin excepted. Being man, He could die and through His death sin was expiated, the devil's power over us was destroyed, the sting of death—sin—lost its poison, its killing power. Now we Christians need not fear temporal death, because it is but the entrance to eternal life.

2 Tim. 1, 10: *Christ hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light.*

Death abolished! An astounding declaration, incomprehensible for human reason, a blessed truth which faith only can grasp! Death *abolished*, *καταργήσαντος*, death annulled, death deprived of its power to terrify, on the one hand; on the other, "*life and immortality*," i. e., immortal life, brought to light through the Gospel. This Christ, our Savior, has accomplished by His work of redemption. Temporal death, the king

of terrors, is changed into a welcome messenger from above. For the Christians, who believe the Gospel, temporal death is no longer a transition from spiritual death to eternal death, but from spiritual life to eternal life and immortality.

Gen. 3, 15: *I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise His heel.*

Adam and Eve transgressed the commandment of God, Gen. 2, 17. Thus sin entered into the world and death by sin. "By the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation," Rom. 5, 18. The victory seemingly was Satan's; all mankind was to be forever in his kingdom — lost — damned. God interposes. He announces to fallen man the Protevangel, Gen. 3, 15, promising a Redeemer. In the presence of our first parents He said to the serpent, or rather to the devil concealed in the serpent: "*I will put enmity between thee,*" the devil, "*and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed.*" A fierce warfare is to rage between the devil and the woman's seed, ending in a glorious victory for the latter and thus for fallen man. That was indeed Gospel, "good tidings," for Adam and Eve and — for us.

Who is "*the seed of the woman*" that is to bring about this victory? None else but Christ. St. Paul authoritatively settles this question Gal. 3, 16. — Our English text reads: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed," and then proceeds: "*It* shall bruise thy head," etc. The antecedent of "*it*" is obvious; it is "*seed.*" "*Seed*" being of the neuter gender in English, the translators chose the neuter pronoun "*it*;" since, however, "*her seed*" is Christ, it is also patent who is meant by "*it*," viz., "*her seed*" = Christ. But though no mistake can be made by the thoughtful reader as to its meaning, the "*it*" is an inaccurate translation. The Hebrew word is *הוא*, which is a personal pronoun of the masculine gender, and should have been rendered: "*He.*" It may be of interest to note that whilst even the Revised Ver-

sion still retains the "it," the American Standard Version correctly translates: "*He shall bruise thy head.*"

A pardonable digression. — In the interest of Mariolatry papacy has changed this pronoun "*He,*" meaning Christ, into "*she,*" meaning Mary. Says the THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, vol. IV, p. 418: "Contrary to all rules of grammar and logic, and what is even worse, contrary to the analogy of faith and to all the teachings of Holy Writ, the Catholic Bible has rendered *אֵת* with *she*, and the teachers of the church of Antichrist have referred this prophecy to Mary, the mother of Christ, and claim that Mary is the one that bruises the serpent's head. Of course, this forgery and blasphemous perversion of God's own Word is calculated to support their Mariolatry and to render this idolatry the more acceptable to the senses of an ignorant and pomp-loving multitude. Many popish churches and cathedrals have been decorated with pictures and paintings representing Mary as the one that treads upon, and crushes, the head of the serpent."

Returning to the matter in hand, we note first that the passage speaks of the conqueror of Satan as being an individual person — "*He*" = Christ. We further observe the expression "*her seed,*" the seed of the woman; Christ, the Redeemer, is to be true man. But the peculiarity of the expression consists in this, that it speaks of "*the seed of the woman.*" Here is an intimation, as in Is. 7, 14, of the Messiah's miraculous conception and birth. Christ is the one made of a woman, born of the Virgin Mary, having no human father, but conceived by the Holy Ghost, Luke 1, 35. — We learn still more of the person of this mighty Victor. God says of Him: *He shall bruise, crush, thy* — the serpent's — *head.* Since the serpent's, i. e., the devil's, head is to be *crushed*, the victory will be a complete victory; the devil will be overcome, Luke 11, 22. But to "destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil," Hebr. 2, 15, is a *divine* work. It is Scriptural to argue from the work to the person who performs the work. He that can crush the devil's head cannot be mere man; he must, at the

same time, be true God. — How clear the prophecy of Christ's humanity and divinity! How clear, too, the prophecy of Christ's signal victory over Satan! Through the Messiah's work Satan's victory shall be undone; the human race shall again be freed from his hellish power. True, Satan will wage a furious warfare. Satan "*shall bruise His heel.*" In this mortal combat Christ receives a wound; the victory is dearly bought. Says Paul: "Ye are bought with a price." But whilst the crushing of the *head* of the serpent is fatal, the crushing of the *heel* of the Victor is not. When reading the clause: "*Thou shalt bruise His heel,*" we are especially reminded of Christ's Great Passion. He was indeed, as Isaiah says, a man of sorrows. Judas, the disciple, betrays Him; Peter, the disciple, denies Him; His own people cry: "Crucify, crucify Him!" Pilate and Caiaphas condemn the Innocent One. He is nailed to the cross. After all, the devil seems to be the victor. But no—all this is merely the bruising of Christ's heel. On the cross He cries out: "It is finished!" By His death He carried out the deadly combat to a glorious victory. (Cf. Hebr. 2, 14. 15.) — "The great dragon was cast down, the *old serpent*, he that is called the devil and Satan, the deceiver of the whole world," Rev. 12, 9. — *Summary.* Gen. 3, 15 is the first Gospel message. It speaks of Christ's Person and His office. It says Christ is true man and true God. It prophesies His sufferings and His complete victory over Satan.

1 John 3, 8: *For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that He might destroy the works of the devil.*

St. John says: "He that committeth sin" willingly, consciously, "is of the devil," is minded like the devil, the devil's sentiment is in him; "for the devil sinneth from the beginning," it was he that made the beginning of sin, he was the first sinner; now, whosoever wantonly sins follows in his footsteps, is governed by him. But Christians, purchased and won from the power of the devil, are to contemplate the purpose of Christ's coming into the world, and then they will not do the devil's bidding. "*For this purpose the Son of God was manifested,*

that He might destroy the works of the devil." Christ destroyed the works of the devil, *i. e.*, sin, and now Christians should sin, wantonly sin, sin intentionally and with aforethought? Nevermore! Why, then they would build up what Christ has destroyed! They would build the devil's kingdom, and building this kingdom, they would but prove that they are in the devil's employ, that they had fallen from grace, that they had received God's grace in vain! It is a contradiction in itself to say, I am a Christian, and still to "commit sin" willingly. "He that committeth sin" is not of Christ, but "of the devil."—Christians, by God's grace, have the power to resist Satan's temptations, 1 Pet. 5, 9.

2 Cor. 5, 21: *He hath made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.*

God is merciful; He is also just. He could not show mercy at the expense of His justice. Sin separated between us and our God. Sin is guilt, our guilt. Guilt demands penalty. This obstacle, penalty of guilt, God removed. How? Christ "*knew no sin*," He was holy, righteous, sinless. Him God made to be sin "*for us*," ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, in our stead. The Holy One took the place of the sinners, the unholy. "*For us*"—that plainly, forcibly, unmistakably expresses the doctrine of substitution. This the apostle here teaches. The translation of the American Standard Version: "on our behalf," is weak and colorless.—"*For us*" Christ was "*made to be sin*." That does not mean that Christ in His nature was now a sinner, or that He committed sin in thought, word, or deed; just as little does it mean this as the correlative clause: "*that we may be made the righteousness of God in Him*," says that our sinful nature were annihilated and replaced by a divine righteous nature. As strongly as possible the assertion is made: "*He knew no sin*." The innocent Christ "*was made to be sin*," not by a physical act, but by a judicial act of God. He was made to be sin by imputation. "The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all," Is. 53, 6. In the eyes of God

Christ is the sinner, the malefactor. God punished our sin in Christ. Thus His justice is satisfied. What was God's purpose in imputing our sin to Christ? "*That we may be made the righteousness of God in Him.*" Our sin has been liquidated by our substitute, Christ, satisfaction is rendered, the penalty is paid, righteousness is merited. Since He has taken our place, His righteousness is our righteousness. Our sin was imputed to Him; His righteousness is imputed to us. That, oftentimes, is very hard for us to believe. We see our sins, know the Law and our shortcomings. But the point is not, What do we think and judge concerning ourselves? but, What does God think of us? God looks upon us in Christ, who is our righteousness.

Is. 53, 4. 5. *Surely He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem Him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed.*

The Ethiopian eunuch, homeward bound from Jerusalem, where he had worshiped, sitting in his chariot, is reading the Prophet Isaiah. By direction of an angel, Philip goes that way, meets the eunuch, and is asked the question, "I pray thee, of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself, or of some other?" Now the passage of the Scripture which he was reading was this: "He was led as a sheep to the slaughter," etc. (Is. 53, 7 ff.) "And Philip opened his mouth, and beginning from this scripture, preached unto him Jesus," Acts 8, 26 ff. Incontrovertibly Is. 53 speaks of Jesus. Isaiah lived about 760 before Christ, but his description of the suffering Messiah is as vivid as though he had stood below the cross at Calvary.

The verses before us treat of the cause of Christ's suffering. — "*Surely!*" The statement to follow is absolutely true, beyond the shadow of a doubt. "*Surely He hath borne our griefs,*" or sicknesses. Observe the stress here, and in the following clauses, upon the pronouns: "*He*" — "*our.*" He was

not suffering for Himself, but for us. This the contrast between "*He*"—"*our*," "*we*"—"*Him*" loudly proclaims. The doctrine of substitution and atonement cannot be more strongly expressed than it is done here, a fact which cannot be emphasized too strongly in our days. Sad to say these precious doctrines—substitution, atonement—are hushed up more and more in denominations outside the Lutheran Church, and in their place a shallow morality is taught.—"*He*"—"*our*" = the Messiah, takes our place, suffers for us. Vicarious suffering—this is the burden of the prophecy. Christ is the Righteous, the Holy One, and He suffers! So He does not suffer for His own, but for sins of others. They are *our* griefs, *our* sorrows; *we* have sinned. *Our* griefs, *our* sorrows rest as a heavy burden upon *Him*. Taken from us, they are imputed to Him. Says Peter: Christ "His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree," 1 Pet. 2, 24. What the prophet says is truth, divine truth. Mark the emphatic assertion: "*Surely* He hath borne our griefs." And willingly, voluntarily, He became our substitute; voluntarily He took the vast burden of our sin upon Himself. The prophet says: "*He* hath borne our griefs." It was His doing, His act; His suffering and death was not a fate He could not have escaped.

To return to the main thought: Our sins were the cause of His suffering; but what did people in general assume to be the cause? "*Yet we did esteem Him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.*" He is a criminal, His crimes have found Him out; God has given this malefactor over to inexorable justice—so men thought then, so now. Blind reason cannot understand the cause of Christ's suffering. What, says the prophet, the Holy Ghost, was the cause? "*But He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities.*" Transgression, iniquity, is sin, is rebellion against the majestic God, and deserves punishment, damnation. The vials of God's wrath should have been poured upon our guilty heads, but He took our—the criminals'—place, and so they were emptied upon Him. And why did He make this vicarious sacrifice?

To redeem us. "*The chastisement of our peace*"—so that we might have peace—"was upon Him." Sin separated between us and our God. This enmity Christ abolished. "Christ is our peace," Eph. 2, 14. How? By bearing the *chastisement*, the punishment, such as God inflicts for sin. Thus our transgressions and iniquities have been atoned for; the penalty is paid. "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea, rather, that is risen again," Rom. 8, 34.

Springfield, Ill.

LOUIS WESSEL.

(*To be continued.*)

STATUS OF THE ENGLISH WORK OF THE GERMAN MISSOURI SYNOD.

From the Synod's Year-Book for 1910, which left the press in March, we attempt again to tabulate the facts which exhibit the extent of the English work of the pastors of the German Missouri Synod. As in former years, and for the reasons formerly stated, the statistics of the Colored Missions reported in the Year-Book are omitted from the calculations following. It might have been proper to include the statistics of missions at penal institutions and institutions of charity, because this work of our pastors is presumably carried on through the medium of the English language, even where no statement to this effect has been made. But as these statistics were not taken account of in previous estimates, to bring them in now would render it difficult to state correctly and briefly the difference between last year's and this year's figures in the various groups.

The English data of the Year-Book are still incomplete. No English preaching has been reported, *e. g.*, from Holy Cross, St. Louis; Richmond, Va.; Memphis, Tenn.; Hammond, Ind. (St. Paul's), etc., though English preaching is known to the writer to be a fixture of these congregations. Quite a number of pastors have reported English confirmations, English baptisms of adults, English Sunday Schools,

English catechising, English parochial schools, or religious instruction in English in their parochial schools, without mentioning that they conduct English services. There are 35 such instances in the Year-Book. These are not included in the tables submitted below, because they would be subject to question. It is understood, then, that the estimate of the Missouri Synod's English work herewith submitted is of the work actually reported. The English work actually performed by the pastors of the Missouri Synod is of greater dimensions than the figures culled from the Year-Book indicate.

The system of groups and divisions, with the nomenclature, adopted in previous statements of this kind, has been retained in the present. It has been possible, however, to reduce the number of divisions, partly because there were no entries for certain divisions which it was formerly necessary to make, partly because the pastors making report had characterized the English work performed by them so exactly that several divisions could be merged into one.

The following tables are subject to revision if any of our readers discover an error.

At the close of 1910, English preaching was reported within the bounds of the German Missouri Synod from 481 places, as follows:

Western District	59 (minus 3)
Central District	58 (plus 2)
Kansas District	38 (plus 11)
Michigan District	38 (plus 8)
Eastern District	37 (plus 6)
Minnesota and Dakota District	35 (minus 1)
Nebraska District	25 (plus 8)
Iowa District	24 (minus 3)
Atlantic District	22 (plus 1)
Wisconsin District	22 (plus 1)
Northern Illinois District	21 (plus 1)
Central Illinois District	17 (minus 2)
Texas District	15 (minus 1)
Oregon and Washington District	14 (no change)
South Dakota District	14 (plus 5)
Southern Illinois District	11 (minus 3)
California and Nevada District	9 (plus 4)
North Dakota and Montana District	9 (new district)
Canada District	8 (no change)
Southern District	5 (minus 6)

Total.....481 (plus 37)

The Minnesota and Dakota District should have no real decrease registered against it, but should rather be credited with an increase of 8, because since our last report the new North Dakota and Montana District was formed out of the territory formerly covered by the Minnesota and Dakota District. The new Dakota District has been assigned a separate column.

Dividing the English work of our pastors, chiefly on the basis of quantity, as in the groups of the last two years, we obtain the following results:—

GROUP A.

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| 1. Entirely English congregations and missions..... | 57 (plus 22) |
| 2. Almost entirely English congregations..... | 4 (plus 1) |
| 3. Congregations in which English predominates..... | 9 (plus 3) |

Total..... 70 (plus 26)

GROUP B.

- | | |
|--|--------------|
| 4. German-English, or English-German congregations.... | 65 (plus 24) |
| 5. Congregations with English preaching every Sunday.. | 29 (plus 6) |

Total..... 94 (plus 20)

GROUP C.

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| 6. Congregations with regular English services..... | 82 (minus 5) |
| 7. Congregations with English services | 31 (minus 9) |
| 8. Congregations with three English services a month... | 1 (minus 1) |
| 9. Congregations with English services every other week | 23 (minus 4) |
| 10. Congregations with English services twice a month.. | 37 (plus 4) |
| 11. Congregations with English services every three weeks | 10 (plus 5) |
| 12. Congregations with English services every four weeks | 3 (minus 4) |
| 13. Congregations with English services once a month... | 112 (plus 4) |

Total..... 299 (minus 10)

GROUP D.

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 14. Congregations with English services once in six weeks | 5 (plus 3) |
| 15. Congregations with English services three times a
month during summer..... | 1 (no change) |
| 16. Congregations with English services occasionally..... | 12 (plus 2) |

Total..... 18 (plus 1)

Group A, Division 1, embraces the following charges reporting a voting membership: Grace of Los Angeles, Cal.; Rust, Mich.; Arcadia, Ind.; Luray, O.; Logan, O.; Creston Tp., Nebr.; Bethany, and Rev. Schuessler's of Chicago, Ill.; Kennewick, Wash.; Henderson Tp., Pa.; Grace of Pittsburgh, Pa.; Dallas, Tex.; Webster Groves, Mo.; Sheboygan,

Wis.—fifteen congregations. Besides these, there are in this division 22 charges reporting communicant membership and souls, 20 charges reporting only the number of souls, and 2 places are registered as “entirely English,” without an attempt to state the numerical strength of the organization. The 57 charges in this division reporting their actual strength total a baptized membership (souls) of 4821 (plus 753), a communicant membership of 2466 (plus 40), a voting membership of 377.

Division 2 embraces the congregation at Van Wert, O., the charges of Reverends Hartmann and Wambsganss at New Orleans, La., and the one at Hannibal, Mo., with a total baptized membership of 1785 (plus 420), communicant membership of 1027 (plus 228), voting membership of 193.

In Division 3 we have Humberstone, Can.; Columbus, O.; Zanesville, O.; Lancaster, O.; Buffalo, N. Y. (Rev. Dallmann’s); McCracken Co., Ky.; Palmyra, Mo.; Messiah of St. Louis, Mo.; and Galesburg, Ill. These charges total a baptized membership of 2898 (plus 107), communicant membership of 1949 (plus 113), voting membership of 477.

The total membership in Group A is 9504 souls (plus 1280), 5442 communicants (plus 381), 1047 voting members.

The numerical strength of the English element in the remaining groups cannot be estimated, because that element is merged in the German census.

For the first time in the history of the Missouri Synod a census of its Sunday Schools has been taken. The various Districts are credited with the following number of pupils:

Atlantic District	15,033	Canada District	1,266
Eastern District	7,432	Michigan District	1,216
Western District	4,908	Texas District	935
Northern Illinois District....	3,274	Nebraska District	835
Central District	2,881	North Dakota and Montana	
Wisconsin District	2,735	District	739
Southern District	2,178	Southern Illinois District....	708
Central Illinois District.....	2,113	Oregon and Washingt’n Distr.	360
California and Nevada Distr.	1,983	South Dakota District.....	315
Minnesota and Dakota Distr.	1,599	Brazil District	110
Iowa District	1,404		
Kansas District	1,326		
		<i>Total</i>	53,343

GROUPS:	A			B		C							D			TOTAL FOR DISTRICT:		
	1		2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14		15	16
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15		16	
DIVISIONS:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16		
Atlantic District.....	1	3	—	6	2	5	—	—	—	5	—	—	3	—	—	—	22	
California and Nevada District.....	3	—	—	1	1	3	—	—	1	4	1	—	—	—	—	—	9	
Canada District.....	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	8	
Central District.....	5	1	3	4	3	17	1	—	3	4	1	2	10	2	—	2	58	
Central Illinois District.....	—	—	1	—	4	2	1	—	—	4	1	—	3	—	—	1	17	
Eastern District.....	2	—	1	8	5	7	—	1	3	5	—	—	5	—	—	—	37	
Iowa District.....	—	—	—	2	1	6	—	—	5	1	—	—	7	1	1	—	24	
Kansas District.....	6	—	—	6	1	6	5	—	1	1	2	1	18	—	—	1	38	
Michigan District.....	3	—	—	7	—	6	—	—	1	2	—	—	2	—	—	1	38	
Minnesota and Dakota District.....	11	—	—	8	—	3	7	—	1	—	1	—	3	1	—	2	35	
Nebraska District.....	4	—	—	2	—	6	7	—	1	1	—	—	3	—	—	1	25	
North Dakota and Montana Distr.	1	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	1	1	1	—	12	—	—	—	9	
Northern Illinois District.....	2	—	—	—	2	2	1	—	—	1	—	—	2	—	—	—	21	
Oregon and Washington District..	3	—	—	—	1	3	3	—	1	1	2	—	2	—	—	—	14	
South Dakota District.....	3	—	—	6	1	1	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	14	
Southern District.....	—	2	—	1	—	1	1	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	
Southern Illinois District.....	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	—	—	—	11	
Texas District.....	5	—	—	4	—	2	1	—	1	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	15	
Western District.....	5	1	3	8	6	9	1	—	1	4	—	—	18	—	—	3	59	
Wisconsin District.....	2	—	—	—	2	2	2	—	1	1	1	—	11	—	—	—	22	
TOTAL FOR DIVISION:	57	4	9	65	29	82	31	1	23	37	10	3	112	5	1	12	481	
TOTAL FOR GROUP:	70			94			299						18					
GRAND TOTAL:																		

However, this host of Sunday School children cannot be credited entirely, perhaps not even for the greater part, to the English work of the Missouri Synod, because many of the pastors making report under this head have stated that they are conducting a German Sunday School.

As in former years, we have exhibited the status of the English work of the German Missouri Synod in tabulated form.

MISCELLANY.

The Spirit of the State Universities is the subject of an "Address delivered at the Charter Day Exercises, University of California, by Dr. Henry S. Pritchett," who is President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Knowledge. This board controls the proceeds of \$15,000,000 donated as a capital by Mr. Carnegie, which proceeds are to be applied to the pensions of teachers at such universities as are complying with the conditions imposed by the Committee. A prime condition is, that the university applying is not to be affiliated in any sense with a religious denomination, in other words, that religion of a positive nature is not to prevail or be recognized in said institution. An education that does not recognize religion, it is charged, cannot develop the whole man, and Mr. Pritchett felt the charge. In the address before us he endeavors to answer it, by asserting that the education he represents, which also he considers ideal for the universities, and which, apparently, he sees them adopt, indeed has a "faith," a religion. Of what nature is this? We cannot claim space for copious extracts from the address; besides, a few sentences will suffice. "If by faith," Mr. Pritchett says (pp. 18. 19), "the men of old subdued kingdoms, quenched the violence of fire, turned to flight the armies of the aliens, by faith no less Charles Darwin and Louis Pasteur wrought righteousness, stopped the mouths of lions, and from their work women re-

ceived their dead raised to life again. To-day, as always, faith leads man on, and the university which is without such a living faith is dead. I believe the American university to be the home of a living, triumphant faith, a faith which, in the largest and truest sense, is also a Christian faith." Again, on p. 23: . . . "a faith broad enough and deep enough to welcome alike Jew and Gentile, Catholic and Protestant, bond and free, wherever the light of truth shines into the hearts of men. The American university is to-day the home of that faith. . . . It is the faith of humanity. . . . And the American university, which embodies the intellectual aspirations of a free people, is becoming day by day also the representative of their spiritual aspirations as well."—Let us note that Mr. Pritchett, who is the man most representative of the American universities to-day, holds that the universities *do and should teach a religion*. In the second place, the faith, or religion, he advocates is in *clear contradiction of the Bible*, entirely setting aside Christ as our Savior. Universities teaching no religion whatever and confining themselves strictly and absolutely to the teaching of branches and subjects assigned them, are at least within their natural province. Our public schools should teach no religion, nor should our public universities, being but advanced public schools, inasmuch as all are supported by public money.—We have seen what kind of "faith," or religion, the universities teach, or are to teach, according to Mr. Pritchett, and if so, they are extremely dangerous, religiously, to all young people, Lutherans included. The seminaries and colleges *Alma Mater* represents are the very opposite in spirit; their motto is, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." What a positive, clearly-defined religion means in the development of character is experienced the more the longer one lives. Students of our colleges do not and cannot, because of their comparative youth, appreciate the full bearing of this. But it certainly is a fact that in the development of a strong Christian character *positive* religious truth,

preached, taught and lived, must be the stay of man in his dealings with fellow-men, and is his only hope in death. When a teacher deals with a student on the question of right and wrong, he cannot hope to achieve any lasting good, unless there be positive religious truths, as a recognized standard, at the base.

A. W. M.

Rev. Geo. H. Ratchford writes in the *Christian Observer* on lack of church discipline as a cause why churches become depleted. Laxity is usually considered a mark of the popular minister, and connivance at the wrongdoings of Christians is thought to attract people to the church. Accordingly, the statements which we approve are surprising and refreshing; however, surprising only in so far as another has come to see an old truth.

There is in our Church a large and growing list of vacant churches, and in the recent Assembly at Lewisburg it was brought to the attention of the commissioners, and published in the report of the Committee on Narrative, that there are now 900 of our churches which are marked "vacant." It has been a matter of surprise to many of our people that this should be the case, and it does seem not a little strange, in view of the fact that there are so many ministers in the Church who are willing and anxious to work, and to serve the Church in the capacity of pastors, and who are able to do the work, and yet are without charges. It has occasioned a good deal of questioning on the part of the Church, and numerous inquiries have been made as to what can be the cause of such a languishing in the life of the Church.

Some of the answers which have been given have partially touched the matter; others have gone wide of the mark. None, or almost none, have made the point that there is a vital relation existing between the ancient and Scriptural custom of discipline in the Church, and the material and spiritual growth and prosperity of the Church. The writer has worked in different Presbyterian churches in the States of Texas, Arkansas, Tennessee, South Carolina, and Oklahoma, and in all these the same condition of things has been found to exist to a greater or less degree.

Discipline has become a forgotten thing. This is hurtful to the Church. In all the foreign lands where our Church has a work among the heathen, discipline is rigorously practiced, and the Church

is growing by leaps and bounds. In the days when discipline was practiced in the home churches, there was no such condition of things as at present. There was then no such scarcity of ministers as at present. There were then no such cases as we have now, where a minister, able, educated, thoroughly orthodox, willing, and anxious to work, recognized as fully equipped for the work, and commended by the Presbytery which had examined him, and approved by the highest authorities in the whole Church, was unable to secure a hearing from a church that was without a pastor and was dying by reason of long vacancy in the pastorate.

The writer knows of individual cases in which there have been vacant churches (some of them vacant for years), which have been in a dying condition for the lack of a man in the pulpit, and which have repeatedly refused to allow men of the highest credentials, approved piety, and full equipment to preach in them, or to take the position of pastor for even a temporary period.

There are other churches in the Assembly which have been vacant for a long period, which have never been able to secure a pastor, though they have repeatedly called men to the position. There are some churches in the Assembly in which the officers have been chosen without regard to their qualifications for the places, and whose conduct and reputation in the community are notorious for evil, and yet nothing is done about it, and these men continue to retain their official positions and church standing, and have even been elected as representatives to the higher courts of the Church.

When such conditions exist within our churches, and are allowed to go on unnoticed; when different officers within the same session are not on speaking terms, when one member of the session refuses to attend church because another one is there; when the private members of the church spend more time and money in the saloons than they do in the church, and when all this is allowed to continue unrebuked for years, and when it is almost as much as a minister's life is worth to mention these facts, is it any wonder that there should be so many vacant churches on our roll? Is it wonderful that such churches should not have pastors?

These things show that there is a vital need of the revival of the exercise of the discipline of the Church, not simply for punishment of the offenders, but more for the purpose of reclaiming them, if possible to show them the enormity of their offenses, to show to others the need of carefulness in the Christian life, and to preserve the life of the Church.

Des Moines, N. Mex.

The following was printed in the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* of March 20:—

Archbishop John J. Glennon made a public pronouncement in behalf of Catholic education before a large congregation which witnessed the reception of postulants and profession of novices at St. Joseph's Convent, in Carondelet, yesterday morning.

"The world to-day is practically divided into two camps," the archbishop said. "On one side is the Catholic Church, standing for the religious training of little children; on the other, the rest of the world, practically united in opposition to the Catholic Church, and consequently in opposition to all religious instruction, and consequently against religion itself."

The deliverance came in sequence of the recent "first communion" letter which the archbishop sent out to pastors of the archdiocese, strongly protesting against other than Catholic education for the children, and urging that children be sent either to the Catholic parish schools or to academies, colleges, or other institutions conducted by religious orders of the Catholic Church.

"It is the kingdom of Satan," he continued, yesterday, "against the kingdom of Christ." The archbishop preceded these remarks with a description of prevailing differences of opinion as to the education of children along religious lines.

"If there was ever a time," he said, "in the world's history when St. Joseph needed helpers to guard the children, it is to-day. The battle-ground of the present day is upon the question of the education of children. It is the point toward which the attention of the thinking world is turned, and which decides the future of our civilization itself. The enemies of St. Joseph and of the Christian family and of the Christ, knowing well that the child is father to the man, and that as the child is trained to-day, so shall be its future, are endeavoring to rob the child of what is his inherent right—namely, that he know his Father, who is in heaven. They want to make the education of the future without religion. They want to divorce religion from education, and thereby control not alone the body, but the soul of the little child."

Nuns militant were commended as a force against this tendency, and the archbishop spoke strongly in favor of the teaching orders. While saying he did not wish to minimize the contemplative orders for which he had only words of commendation, he declared he saw a great work for the religious orders which teach the children. He said different ages of the world bring forth different forms of religious activity. When the world, touched by pagan Rome and pagan

Greece, was very wicked, the tendency of members of religious orders was to leave the world entirely, "to save their own souls, even if in doing so they failed to help others," he said. But the archbishop declared, "The teaching order is the order best suited to the church's need in these later days."

Inquiry at the publisher's office, whether there was not some error in the reporter's account of what Archbishop Glennon had said, brought the assurance that he had been reported correctly. — At the time of the election of President Cleveland there were attacks made upon parochial schools, especially in Illinois and Wisconsin. These attacks brought out the fact that Lutherans, *e. g.*, believed in the religious training of their children, and would suffer fines and imprisonment rather than surrender what they consider a divine and a constitutional right. All America learned these facts at the time, and we have personal knowledge of the joy which this position of the Lutherans caused in Catholic circles; for it made Lutherans — strange to relate! — for once practical allies of the Catholics. There is not the least doubt in our mind that the Archbishop of St. Louis knows all this. Moreover, the Archbishop lives in a city where church-schools other than Roman Catholic are not entirely conspicuous by their absence. Some of them, *e. g.*, one on Twentieth and Benton Sts., another on Ohio Ave., near Winnebago St., another on Eighth St., near Lafayette Ave., are so large that they could hardly be overlooked. And we do not believe for a moment that a gentleman who is so well informed about the city in which he lives as the Roman Archbishop of St. Louis does not know these facts. We would like to charge him with blank ignorance because of his remarks on religious training of children being an exclusive custom of the Roman Catholic Church. But we are persuaded that his information was better than his utterance. What, then, is a proper explanation of his action? Bigotry, sheer bigotry. The Reverend Romanist wishes to be understood as saying: There is no religion outside of the Romanist religion. If you teach your child, let us say, Luther's Small Catechism, you are

strengthening the kingdom of Satan. — We have heard these views expressed before. We recognize in this Romanist's expressions "his master's voice."

About a year ago the following account was cabled to the *Chicago Daily Tribune* from London:—

George Bernard Shaw, addressing the Eugenic Education Society, to-night advocated the abolition of property and marriage, and authorization by the state to kill undesirables.

"It is most obvious to everybody," he said, "that before we can begin to breed the human race with a view to its improvement, we must go further in the direction of political revolution than the most extreme Socialist now ventures to suggest publicly. It is evident that we need the entire abolition of property and marriage, as now understood, as a preliminary step. I do not see any way out of that.

"I have found when addressing audiences on political questions that they immediately get extraordinarily interested whenever I touch upon the subject of marriage in the improvement of the human race. They already feel that if it is demonstrable that property is incompatible with achieving a high level of humanity, property must go, and it is evident that if they could be made to conceive that marriage also is incompatible with reaching that level, they would be prepared to consider whether marriage should not go."

Briefly attributing the existence of poverty, ignorance, and idleness to property, Shaw did not elaborate on this point, merely adding:

"Let us only get rid of property, and we shall get rid of all that."

He then concentrated his remarks on the marriage question.

"It is the experience of almost everybody regarding marriage," he said, "that instead of people finding themselves in a great community of marriageable persons of their own age, there are only about three persons within their reach, and they do not like any of them. Nevertheless, they have to make the best they can of these three. They are driven into a marriage which consequently hardly ever represents their natural impulse, yet the natural impulse seems to be the only thing which can be trusted for the improvement of the race."

Shaw contended that in order to give the natural impulse a chance to operate satisfactorily, there ought to be a serious effort to make the whole community intermarriageable, and to widen the sphere of sexual selection. Eugenic politics should be directed to those ends. Mating now was mainly a matter of income. A man might see an attractive scrubwoman, but he could not very well marry

her. Then he might see a duchess who would not want to marry him. In order to improve things the state would have to provide incomes for everybody and see that each person earned his income.

"Eugenic politics," continued Shaw, "would land us in the extensive use of the lethal chamber. It would be necessary to revise our views of the sacredness of human life. We should find ourselves committed to the killing of a great many people. Some would have to be removed simply because it wastes other people's time to look after them.

"On the other hand, we should leave living many people we now kill. We should have to get rid of all ideas of capital punishment. It is right to kill a man who cannot be trusted to go about in society without injuring others, but a man may commit murder, and yet be a perfectly safe and desirable citizen afterwards. Indeed, it might have been a desirable thing to have removed the murdered man. A man ought to be allowed to commit a certain number of crimes just as he is allowed to have a certain number of sicknesses."

Recurring to marriage, Shaw put a hypothetical case.

"Suppose property had been abolished," he said, "a whole community made intermarriageable, and a department of eugenics established. This department, in making experiments, might introduce a man to a woman and tell him he is to marry her.

"The man might object that she had a bad temper, and he therefore did not wish to live with her. The department would reply that her temper was the reason it wished him to marry her. 'We think,' would be its argument, 'that crossing her temper with your temperament would produce a highly desirable temperament.'

"It seems to me that to meet cases of that kind we shall have to make some provision by which women can become mothers without having to live domestically with the fathers of their children."

This drew applause from the audience, whereupon Shaw said:

"I notice that immediately I begin to talk immorality I get a response. I am so gratified with that success that I will not try to improve on it, but will sit down."

The speaker is a member of the Fabian Society of socialists. He became known to the world of fame first as a brilliant musical critic and journalist and as a writer of fiction and drama. Into all his literary productions "he works in most various ways his brilliant presentations of the ideas of Fabian socialism." The above account surely suffices to make him known forever in the world of infamy.

On the question of what it costs to create a Romish saint, the *Independent* lately obtained "inside information," which it published as follows:—

The leading Catholic organ in Germany, the *Germania*, of Berlin, which sometimes ventures to criticise pretty freely things that happen within the pale of the Mother Church, recently published with critical purposes an account of the costs of a beatification, declaring that its information is from official sources.

It distinguishes between a public proclamation of a "blessed" person (beatification) and of one declared a saint (canonization). The costs for the former are: Introduction of the proposal, 10,000 francs; the process "non cultu," 2000 francs; the process "de fama sanctitatis," 2000 francs; the process "de validitate," 2000 francs; the investigation concerning the "virtues" of the candidate, 12,000; the decree on this matter, 1000; approval of the examination concerning the miracles performed by the candidate, 2000; the investigation itself, 12,000; the "second decree," 1000; the congregation and decree "de tuto," 3000; the costs of the ceremony, 50,000 francs.

The expenses attending a canonization are these: Preparing the case, 2000; approval of the miracles, 2000; examination concerning these miracles, 12,000; the decree, 1000; the congregation and the decree "de tuto," 3000; cost of the ceremony proper, 100,000; other expenses, 50,000 francs. The total expenses of either of these ceremonies is, accordingly, from 260,000 to 270,000 francs.

Nowadays there are always two of such beatifications taken together in order to lessen the costs; but the *Germania* adds that this decrease is very small. It adds that, in connection with such a ceremony, the decorations in St. Peter's cost more than 150,000 francs, the papal concessions, by actual count, cost about 2000 francs for candles alone; the preparation of the papal throne at the recent ceremonies involved an expenditure of 12,276 francs; the candles on the altar at the High Mass cost 1287 francs; the presents given by the postulants on this occasion to the Pope amounted to 1438 francs; the new coverings needed for the altars on such occasions cost 13,000 francs; the rent paid to the Chapter of St. Peter for the utensils, etc., used is 18,000 francs, while at the last ceremony the presents and tips given to the officials and servants of the Vatican amounted to exactly 16,396 francs. The architect of the ceremony of beatification received for his work 7000 francs and for his preliminary sketches an additional 1200. The *Germania* closes its instructive list of expense items with a significant "and so forth"!

But who paid the money for the late canonization of Joan of Arc? Doubtless her French devotees.

June 6, 1911, will be remembered as the date of a tragedy without a parallel in the annals of our country. On that day the heads of our government had gone to Baltimore to pay homage to the Church of Rome. The occasion was the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of Cardinal Gibbons' initiation into the priesthood of his church. Events of this character have occurred ere this in the churches of our country, and there is no reason why the people of any one church should not honor the men who have served them in positions of trust. Such celebrations are church affairs,—nothing else. If government officials have taken any notice of them, it was as private citizens. An attempt was made to divest the presence of President Taft, Vice-President Sherman, Speaker Cannon, Senator Root, Governor Crothers, Mayor Pressley, Ambassador Bryce, and Ex-President Roosevelt at the Cardinal's jubilee of all official meaning. But if these gentlemen think that they have convinced the intelligent citizens of the North American Republic that politics had nothing to do with their participation in the honors conferred on a Roman priest, they give their fellow-citizens credit for very little critical judgment and independence of thought. Cardinal Gibbons may have exhibited in his long life virtues which deserve praise. There are thousands of good citizens and good Christians in all walks of life in the United States who have served their country and their church just as sincerely and efficiently as he has, if not better. Or do we wish to insinuate that it is an extraordinary event when a person in high station in the Roman Church proves a good citizen, and therefore deserves to be exceptionally honored? The honors heaped upon the American Cardinal were honors shown not to the man Gibbons, or citizen Gibbons, but to "the prince" of the Church of Rome. Rome has scored a distinct triumph when it brought "the wheels of government pretty nearly to a stop" on June 6. Well might the Cardinal smile at the unusual spectacle which the heads of the nation had prepared for him, and the eulogies which they pronounced upon him and his church. In his reply to the speeches that had

been made in his honor, the Cardinal, with studied exactness, dwelt on the *official* character of the speakers. He should probably have cared very little about what private citizen Taft, or private citizen Roosevelt, or private citizen Cannon, etc., had to say about him, but he cared very much about what the heads of our national government had to say. Hence the smile and the undisguised pleasure. — We reiterate what has been stated in these pages before, *viz.*, that the Church of Rome has officially denounced our form of government, and that Cardinal Gibbons, as a loyal son of the Pope, has officially endorsed the utterances of his Italian master. We would here enter our solemn protest against the prostitution of the dignity and authority of our government on the occasion at Baltimore. We consider the action of our government officials a disgrace to the nation. Incidentally we may record the fact that on this very occasion Ex-President Roosevelt has replied to the Lutheran letter of protest of November 10, 1909, thus: "We will see presidents who are Catholics, as well as presidents who are Protestants." This shows that it is useless to argue with Mr. Roosevelt. But we trust that the nation will not soon forget what happened at the Fifth Regiment Armory at Baltimore on June 6, 1911.

Attempts have been made time and again to illustrate the basic idea in the doctrine of the Trinity. All illustrations, however, break down when measured against the coeternity, consubstantiality, and coequality of the Three Persons in One Essence. The following from the *Chicago Evening American* of May 22 fails likewise to *explain* what will ever be and remain a mystery.

"There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one," 1 John 5, 7. — This quotation is sent to us by a reader who apparently has lost his faith in religious teachings, and expresses the belief that any teaching as to a religious Trinity is an impossibility, an absurdity which should not be imposed upon the human mind. It is well occasionally to remind human beings that things which to them *seem* impossible are not impossible, and that statements which we believe to be the crea-

tions of imagination and scheming are often expressions of profound truth. As an example and proof of the fact that a Trinity may be *real*, and that three separate things *may* find expression through three voices, and that all three of them may be one, we ask our friend to imagine the following conditions: You are sitting in a room with the door closed. In the adjoining room there is a sound, the playing of a Beethoven sonata. You hear the music. If you had never seen a piano, and knew nothing of music, you would not believe that in that room there were three separate and distinct forces, giving expression simultaneously to one thought, one sound. You would not believe if it were said to you, "In that room there are three that bear record of the greatness of musical genius, the piano, the artist, and the dead composer; and these three are one."

This incident proves no more than this, *viz.*, that one person may appropriate and apply the labor of two others who have preceded him.

BOOK REVIEW.

Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., announces the following publications:—

1. A doctrinal paper on *The Decorum and Order with which a Well-Organized Lutheran Congregation Strives to Conduct All Its Affairs*; read before the convention of the Wisconsin District of the Missouri Synod by *Prof. C. Ross*. 24 pages; 12 cts. This brochure also contains a carefully prepared and lucid presentation of the status of the missions of the District, and the District's Articles of Incorporation.

2. A doctrinal paper on *The Missionary Activity of Paul*; read before the North Dakota and Montana District of the Missouri Synod by *Rev. C. H. Lueker*. 9 pages; 10 cts. This is the first report of this District, which was newly organized in 1909. The opening sermon of *Rev. W. Friedrich* from 1 Pet. 2, 9 on "The Purpose which Synods are to Serve" is an able and valuable utterance, which deserves to be published in pamphlet form for distribution in our new districts.

3. A doctrinal paper on the words of the Creed: "I Believe a Life Everlasting;" read before the California and Nevada District of the Missouri Synod by *Rev. H. Haserodt*. 34 pages; 12 cts.

4. A doctrinal paper on *The Second Article of the Augsburg Confession*; read before the Central Illinois District of the Missouri

Synod by *Rev. C. A. Huzhold*. 43 pages; 12 cts. The value of this paper on Original Sin is enhanced by apt references to errors existing on this subject outside of the Lutheran Church.

5. A doctrinal paper on *Holy Baptism*, with special reference to *Infant Baptism*; read before the Central District of the Missouri Synod by *Rev. P. Eickstaedt*. 29 pages; 11 cts. This pamphlet contains an appreciative obituary notice of Praeses Niemann, for thirty years the able presiding officer of this old and influential District; also resolutions adopted by the District for the management of the Schoenewald legacy.

6. A doctrinal paper on *The Source of Christian Doctrine*; read before the Texas District of the Missouri Synod by *Prof. L. W. Dorn*. 84 pages; 22 cts.

7. A doctrinal paper on *The Titles which Christians are Accorded in the New Testament*; read before the Ev. Luth. Synodical Conference by *Rev. W. Dallmann*. 19 pages; 12 cts. This pamphlet contains the report on the reception of the District Synod of Nebraska and of the Slovakian Evangelical A. C. Synod of Pennsylvania into the Synodical Conference; also a statement on the present status of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Michigan, which body has reentered the Synodical Conference by connecting with the Wisconsin Synod. The report of the Conference's mission to the colored freedmen of the South is very extensive.

8. A doctrinal paper on *The State, the Bible, and the Papacy*; read before the Canada District of the Missouri Synod by *Rev. J. Sohn*. 22 pages; 9 cts. This paper is a study of conditions existing in the Dominion of Canada as regards the relation of the Church to the State.

9. A doctrinal paper on *The Migration of the Israelites to the Land of Promise*; read before the Iowa District of the Missouri Synod by *Rev. C. Runge*. 42 pages; 15 cts. This pamphlet contains an important statement regarding complaints lodged with the presiding officer of the District and regarding the right of visitation and congregational rights, also an obituary notice of the death of *Rev. Ernst Zuerrer*, for many years the respected Praeses of the District; also an overture to the Delegate Synod, advocating the creation of a sixth professorship at the Springfield Seminary; also a statement on the present legal status of the Schmeiser estate near Burlington.

10. A doctrinal paper on *Missionary Activity in the Apostolic Era*; read before the Kansas District of the Missouri Synod by *Prof. Fr. Streckfuss*. 54 pages; 15 cts. The "Report on St. John's

College at Winfield" shows that the Commercial Department and the coeducational feature of this institution were endorsed by the District.

11. A doctrinal paper on *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ*; read before the Eastern District of the Missouri Synod by Rev. W. Broecker. 74 pages; 21 cts. This paper is the second sequel of a paper begun three years ago. The pamphlet contains a fine survey of the District's missions and of the operations of the Church Extension Fund.

12. A doctrinal paper on *Samuel, the Reformer of the People of the Old Covenant*; read before the Southern Illinois District by Rev. J. Andreae. 43 pages; 15 cts.

13. A doctrinal paper on *The Care of Our Young People after Their Confirmation*; read before the Western District of the Missouri Synod by Rev. Rich. Kretzschmar. 21 pages; 10 cts. The prospectus of the District's missions is prepared with exceptional care. The report contains a declaration of the District on the Prohibition movement.

14. *Statistical Yearbook* of the German Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and other States for the year 1910. 205 pages; 40 cts. Contains general and special accounts of the activities of the Missouri Synod, with statistical tables exhibiting the year's work in each and every parish.

15. *Concordia-Blaettchen fuer die Kleinen*. Erstes Quartal, 1911. *Concordia-Sonntagsschul-Lektionen fuer Mittelklassen*. Januar 1911; ditto, *fuer Oberklassen*. The same publications are to be had in English under the following titles, respectively: *Concordia Primary Leaflets*; *Concordia Sunday School Lessons for Junior Department*; ditto, *for Senior Department*. — These are the publications which we were able to announce in our January issue. (p. 46.) These publications are epochal in the educational work of the Missouri Synod. We have read them with delight and recommend their use, wherever necessary, most heartily.

16. *Concordia Pupil's Roster*. By means of this device (a tabulated reference card) "it is the work of but a moment, even after many years, to look up any former pupil's name and have before you all the 'personalities' that are likely to be sought." Address Concordia Publishing House for prices on various outfits.

17. A glass paper weight, $3 \times \frac{1}{2} \times 1$ inch, exhibiting the likeness of Walther, from the steel engraving appended to his "Evangelien-Postille." 25 cts; carriage prepaid, 35 cts.

18. *Festbuechlein zur hundertjaehrigen Geburtstagsfeier Dr. C. F. W. Walthers*, des gesegnetsten lutherischen Zeugen Amerikas. Unserer lutherischen Schuljugend dargeboten von W. Wegener. 16 pages; 5 cts. This little tract is well adapted for use in our schools preparatory to the celebration of Walther's birthday throughout the Missouri Synod in October. It contains a portrait of Walther of 1857, which has never been published. An English edition of this tract is in course of preparation.

19. *Synodalalbum*. Bilder von allgemeinem Interesse aus der Deutschen Ev.-Luth. Synode von Missouri, Ohio u. a. St. 85 pages, on art paper and in art form; 25 cts. Contains views of all the institutions of the Missouri Synod and portraits of all its presiding officers and professors, with brief but accurate descriptive matter opposite each view. If the sale of this first venture which Concordia Publishing House makes in this direction justifies a repetition, new editions of the *Synodalalbum*, revised and brought up to date, will be published from time to time.

20. *Concordia Attendance Register*. 75 cts. A blank book, strongly bound in black cloth, for registering attendance of pupils in schools. It accommodates 500 names for one year.

OUTLINES OF DOCTRINAL THEOLOGY. By A. L. Graebner.
St. Louis, Mo. Concordia Publishing House. 1910.
\$1.50.

This work is, in the main, a mere reprint of the well-known dogmatic text-book of the sainted Dr. Graebner. The only change that has been made occurs in § 141, on the effects of the call, and reads in the new edition as follows: "By the divine power residing in the means of grace, and working through the same, the calling grace of God effects regeneration, or conversion. Wherever these effects are not attained, this is due to obstinate resistance on the part of man." The old text ran thus: "All those in whom the effects of the calling grace of God are not by obstinate resistance frustrated, are, by the divine power residing in the means of grace and working through the same, regenerated or converted." This change was adopted with a view to bring out the author's mind more fully. Non-resistance explains nothing as regards the effects of the call, and the author was very outspoken on just this point. — A number of incorrect Scripture references have been corrected, and the size of the book, owing to more compact linotype composition, has been reduced from 288 to 250 pages. — Graebner's *Out-*

lines is still the text-book in English Dogmatics at Concordia Seminary. Though the thetical statements of the author in not a few places are heavy and cumbersome as regards style, owing to heroic efforts at condensation and compactness, still the book has such undoubted merits, as, *e. g.*, lucid arrangement and logical division of the dogmatical material, discriminating choice of Bible proofs, and others, that it will not easily become antiquated. We commend its perusal to all aspirants to theology.

LEBENSBLDER AUS DER GESCHICHTE DER CHRISTLICHEN KIRCHE. Fuer lutherische Leser Nordamerikas bearbeitet und ausgewaehlt von *E. A. W. Krauss*, Professor am Concordia-Seminar zu St. Louis, Mo. Concordia Publishing House. VIII and 800 pages. \$2.50.

We have before us a product that delights the eye and the heart. It is a ponderous book, artistically printed and bound, and profusely illustrated, also by expensive insertions of photogravures of ancient Mss. By its attractive exterior the book will prove an ornament in any bookcase. But the best part, of course, are the contents. Professor Krauss holds the chair of Church History at Concordia Seminary, which was vacated by the death of the late Dr. Graebner. Everywhere in this book the author's wide and careful reading is in evidence. The author possesses the gift of narrating instructively and entertainingly. One never tires following his lucid accounts of the leading events in the history of the Christian Church in all ages, from the era of the apostles down to most recent times. The plan followed in this book is eclectic. Characteristic events and personages, such as have exerted an unmistakable formative influence on their times and on posterity, are described chiefly. Still the book is not a mere collection of unconnected essays, but is sufficiently connected throughout to pass for a panoramic view of the entire rise, progress, decay, restoration, etc., of the Christian Church. The two additions at the end, on Muehlenberg and Walther, render the book especially interesting to American Lutherans. The author's judgment at every point is that which we should expect to find in an orthodox Lutheran. However, the book is by no means one-sided; the author shows appreciation for what is good wherever he finds it, and applies deserved criticism in like manner. We sincerely rejoice to see this book on the market, and would urge every one whom this notice may reach to lose no time purchasing and reading it.

EVANGELISCH-LUTHERISCHE KATECHETIK. Von J. H. Herzer, Professor am Concordia-Seminar zu Springfield, Ill. St. Louis, Mo. Concordia Publishing House Print. 1911. XIII and 314 pages. \$1.50 net; postage, 15 cts. extra. Concordia Publishing House or author receive orders.

We hail with joy the advent of this Lutheran text-book on catechetics, which offers a systematic presentation of catechetical theology. In its pages there are condensed the labors of a long life spent on the study of Luther's Catechism, and the most efficient ways of inculcating its blessed contents. The author has arranged his vast material in 63 theses,—still the best method available for a text-book. These theses are elaborated in extensive notes, distinguished by special type. The subject matter of each thesis is stated in a brief heading. In the Introduction the author discusses the meaning and scope of catechetics and the divisions of catechetical theology. (pp. 1—9.) The First Part deals with catechising as an established institution of the Church ("Der Katechumenat"). It discusses the idea underlying this institution, the history of catechising, the catechumens, the catechist, his qualifications and duties, and the various applications of this form of teaching, at home, at school prior to confirmation, in the catechetical service at church, and in the teaching of adults and applicants for membership from other churches. (pp. 10—38.) Part II discusses the catechetical material ("Der Katechismus"). It presents the source, basis, rule, and norm of all catechetical material, the divine Word, and of the catechetical method of teaching religion; relates the origin of Luther's Catechism, explains its structure and harmonious excellency, and reviews the immense literature on Luther's Catechism that has been published since 1527. (pp. 39—76.) Part III treats of catechetical instruction as regards its method and form ("Die Katechese"). Naturally this is the *piece de resistance* of the book. It divides into two sections. First, the author speaks of the method of instructing by means of catechising, its usefulness, the necessary preparation for such an effort, the essential parts of a catechetical treatise, catechetical divisions, explanations, definitions, arguments, refutations, etc. Secondly, the author discusses the great *crux* in all catechetical effort: the catechetical question and the catechetical answer. The bulk of the author's earnest labor, which is indeed evident throughout the book, lies in this last part. (pp. 77—310.) The book is brimful of illuminating discussions and helpful suggestions. It is apt, when once mastered, to render the catechist's labor immensely more easy and congenial to our pastors and teachers.

EINS IST NOT. Predigten ueber die Evangelien des Kirchenjahres nebst sechs Passionspredigten ueber Jes. 53 von *Eduard L. Arndt*, Pastor der Ev.-Luth. Dreieinigkeitsgem. zu Saginaw, Mich. 1885—1897. Seitdem Professor am Concordia College und Hilfspastor an der Ev.-Luth. St. Stephanusgemeinde zu St. Paul, Minn. Northwestern Publishing House Print, Milwaukee, Wis. 1911.

GREEN PASTURES. Sermons on the Gospels of the Ecclesiastical Year. By the same author. Danish Lutheran Publishing House, Blair, Nebr. 1911. Both publications to be had from the author, 1230 St. Anthony Ave., St. Paul, Minn.

These sermons witness the author's unmistakable zeal to communicate to others what he has learned from his revered teachers, Dr. Walther and Prof. Lange, to whose memory these volumes have been dedicated. The sermons are, no doubt, the fruits of the author's pastoral activity. The first volume contains 80 German sermons, eight of them (not the eight Lenten Sermons) for special occasions. The second volume contains 81 sermons, 10 of them for special occasions, and the last seven Lenten sermons. The sermons in both collections are meaty, direct, in places even to the degree of brusqueness, and bear messages of warning and comfort for the life that now is, and that which is to come.

HOMILETISCHES REALLEXIKON NEBST INDEX RERUM von *E. Eckhardt*. H. Blair, Nebr. 1910. Pages b463 to c88. Bound, \$2.35, or \$1.95 in parts.

This is the fourth volume of the laborious and commendable undertaking of Rev. Eckhardt. It carries the cataloguing of the contents of our publications forward from "Hades" to "Lutherische Schriften." In an appendix the author furnishes a table of the Sundays of the ecclesiastical year for which outlines or homiletical references are found in the volumes of the Index so far published, also a scheme by which the year of publication for each Report published by the Districts of our Synod or by the Delegate body can be established.

AUXILIARIUM. Predigtentwuerfe aus der fuenfzigjaehrigen Amtszeit des seligen Pastor *C. Gross* sen. Dargeboten von seinen Soehnen *C. und E. W. Gross*. Viertes Heft. St. Louis, Mo. Concordia Publishing House Print. 1911. 88 pages; 45 cts.

We have repeatedly noted this meritorious publication in these pages. The present number is an able sequel to the foregoing. In the First Part we have 44 outlines on the Gospel and Epistle pericopes for Trinity Sunday to the Seventh Sunday after Trinity. The Second Part offers an outline for the anniversary of a Young Men's Society, an outline for an ordination sermon, and 22 outlines for Lenten sermons, mostly on the history of the Passion.

DIE ABENDSCHULE. Walther-Nummer. Ein Festgruss zum Ehrengedaechtnis des teuren Gottesmannes Dr. C. F. W. Walther, zu seinem hundertjaehrigen Jubilaeum. Louis Lange Publishing Co., St. Louis, Mo. 15 cts.

The Walther centenary has called forth many efforts by which the services of Walther as a theologian and a churchman have been estimated, valued, and eulogized. This happy venture of the *Abend-schule* gives us glimpses of Walther's home-life; it depicts Walther in the more quiet walks of his busy life, as a father, friend, neighbor, in his social relations, etc. The issue abounds in illustrations, and will be read with delight.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER'S KLEINER KATECHISMUS nebst zwei Anhaengen: "Kurze Form, wie das Vaterunser zu beten," sowie: "Luthers Trau- und Taufbuechlein." Pocket size; 96 pages; paper, 10 cts.; canvas, 15 cts. Johannes Herrmann, Zwickau, Sachsen, Publisher.

We do not remember having seen Luther's *Enchiridion* in such a convenient size, with the two valuable additions appended. It is a most serviceable gift to our young people.

GOLDKOEERNER. Predigten von *Dr. C. F. W. Walther*. Wohlfeile Jubilaeumsausgabe mit Dr. Walthers Bildnis. Published by Johannes Herrmann, Zwickau, Sachsen. 1911. 30 cts.

Walther's "Nuggets of Gold"—thus named at the time of their first appearance in print by Rev. O. Willkomm—are here

offered in an extraordinarily cheap edition, but on good paper, well printed and tastefully bound. It is one of the most thoughtful and appreciable souvenirs that could have been suggested for this memorial year. The sermons are indeed pure gold from the mines of God's Word.

MISSIONSPOSTKARTEN. Published by Johannes Herrmann, Zwickau, Sachsen; also to be had at Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 20 cts.

This series consists of nine cards containing views of the Missouri Synod's mission workers and missions in Travancore, India.

THEOLOGICAL ENCYCLOPEDIA AND METHODOLOGY, by *Reverend Franklin Weidner*, D. D., LL. D. Second Edition, Entirely Rewritten. Chicago, Wartburg Publishing House. \$1.50 net.

Twenty-two, resp. twenty years ago the author published two volumes which are now supplanted by the one before us. It comprises the departments of Historical Theology (Sacred History, Biblical Theology, Church History, History of Doctrines, Patristics, Symbolics, Ecclesiastical Archaeology, Statistics), Systematic Theology (Apologetics, Dogmatics, Ethics), Practical Theology (Evangelistics, Diaconics, Catechetics, Liturgics, Homiletics, Pastoral Theology, Church Polity).—The logic of this division and arrangement of the departments of theology is subject to question. The author's opening sentence conveys no clear meaning; he says: "The result of the application of Exegetical Theology to the Bible lays the foundation of Historical Theology." This is a *lucus a non*, if it is to explain why Historical should be placed before Systematic Theology. The real explanation why this has been done, we think, is given in the author's definition and scope of Systematic Theology: it "is the highest form of theological science. . . . We may define it as the scientific presentation of Christian doctrine in its relation to both faith and morals. . . . Although we accept the fact of Christianity as a divine fact, this presupposition must be justified by a scientific discussion to the religious consciousness." The view here expressed is at present the prevailing one; nevertheless, it is not a *novum*. It is about two hundred years old; its advent coincides with the rise of Rationalism. The immense and earnest labors of writers on Systematic Theology prior to the coming of Scientific Theology, and much of what has been written since then in this department

of theology, is a protest against this conception of Systematic Theology. The early Christian and the early Lutheran writers on Dogmatics cannot be placed in the camp which has hoisted the "scientific" flag: they regard that as a rebel flag. An author of a students' text-book who fails to impress on his readers this fact with the utmost clearness and emphasis, *viz.*, that the old Lutheran and the modern Protestant view of what constitutes theology differs *toto coelo* from each other, differ as much as *sic et non*,—fails to do justice to his subject and is not fair to the student.—We were startled, too, by the author's remarks on "Confessional Dogmatics." He says: "A dogmatics that is Christian without any qualifying feature, to be satisfactory to Roman Catholic and Protestant in a scientific point of view, is wholly inconceivable." Again: "Any practice . . . which so identifies the name Lutheran as absolutely equivalent to the name Christian—is thoroughly un-Lutheran." It requires a great deal of courage to write such statements in the face of the declarations in the Augsburg Confession and the Preface to the Book of Concord. In the last analysis such statements reduce the Church of the pure Word of God to a sect on a level with other sects. If in the phrase "Lutheran dogmatics" the term "Lutheran" means anything else than that the particular book was written by an author who happened to be a member of the Lutheran Church, if "Lutheran" is opposed to, and distinguished from, "Christian," we decline to be called Lutheran.—We note the disproportionate treatment accorded to Catechetics, pp. 198—204; Liturgics, pp. 204—230; Homiletics, pp. 231—252.—In the chapter on Church Polity we find the following: "The Presbyterian Polity has been adopted by many Lutheran churches, both in Germany, France, and in this country. In fact, Presbyterianism, in its generic sense, is the form of church government most generally adopted by Lutheran Synods. In the Lutheran Church we find also the Congregational form of government represented, especially in the Synodical Conference and a few independent synods. Where synods have only advisory power, and no legislative power, the polity is mainly Congregational." We understand this distinction between the polity of the Synodical Conference and most other Lutheran Synods in this country to mean that, *e. g.*, the General Council claims legislative, not merely advisory powers in relations to its congregations. If we are wrong in so reading Dr. Weidner, we hope to be corrected.—Dr. Weidner's book contains a great deal of information that is necessary to the student of theology. It can be studied with profit. But it does not represent what has been, or is to-day, the best that the Lutheran Church could offer.

THE EISENACH GOSPEL SELECTIONS MADE READY FOR PULPIT WORK, by *R. C. H. Lenski*. Vol. I: First of Advent to Trinity Sunday; 664 pages. Vol. II: First Sunday after Trinity to Thanksgiving; 451 pages. Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O. 1910.

An effort to perpetuate in the English Lutheran Church the pericopal preaching which has been a historic fixture in the German Lutheran Church deserves commendation. It relieves the agony of text-selection, secures the ministers against the charge of sinister motives in the choice of a text, provides for a fuller, more orderly, and systematic presentation of the truths of salvation, and habituates the regular church-goers generation after generation to the beautiful and impressive meaning of the sequence of seasons and festivals of the Christian church-year. The Eisenach pericopes possess a merit of their own over and against the old system in use in our Church, and this merit has been recognized also in the homiletical literature of our own body. In the work before us the following plan has been adopted: First, there is a sketch descriptive of the general character of a given cycle in the ecclesiastical year, the Christmas Cycle, the Epiphany Cycle, etc. Secondly, the Gospels for each Sunday in the cycle are taken up separately. The text is explained from the original, with evident exegetical care to arrive at the true meaning of words and clauses. In the third place, we have "homiletical hints," in which the doctrinal yield of each text is summed up, and the lines of thought which the sermonizer may adopt and work out are indicated. Copious references to the Lutheran Confessions and to standard exegetical works enliven Parts II and III. Lastly, the author presents the sermon *in nuce*, as it should be constructed from the expository and homiletical material in the preceding parts. We have here the thesis of the sermon with its divisions, the conventional theme and parts. Usually there is a variety of these given, some of them original suggestions of the author, some gleaned from the works of well-known preachers. The plan and construction of this work is, in the main, that of Nebe, and we can register our unqualified endorsement of it. — We have been struck with the absence in this work of plain and clear statements of those doctrinal views which divide the author and his body from us. His remarks on the *γινώσκειν*, in John 10, 27 (2, 335), are guarded. His rejection of predestination in the Calvinistic sense (2, 358) is correct. But the author's remarks on John 10, 29: "My Father, which hath given them to me," etc., were written under the spell of the *intuitu fidei*. He says: "All men belong to the Father

in that special sense in which He is the Creator of all. Some of these by faith through God's grace become true spiritual children of God, and these the Father gives to the Son, the great Redeemer, as the reward for His labor, to live under Him in His kingdom." Why does not the author say plainly how he views the relation of the believer's faith to the *δέδωκεν* in this text?

THE TOPICAL EXCERPT LIBRARY. Consisting of sermons, editorials, addresses, poems, excerpts from many sources. Compiled by *Euclid B. Rogers*, D. D. Twenty volumes. The Springfield Library Publishing Co., Springfield, Ill. Vol. I: Atonement, 390 pages; vol. IV: Christianity, 390 pages; vol. VIII: Heaven—Immortality, 394 pages; vol. XVI: Service, 399 pages; vol. XVIII: Spiritual Life, 398 pages.

This work aims to aid the sermonizer and the lecturer on religious topics. As its name indicates, it is a compilation from many sources. The compiler's purpose was to reproduce "what the great thinkers of this era have thought and said" on a given subject. In an introductory remark J. H. Collins explains the origin and practicableness of the *Excerpt Library* as follows: "When one takes up a subject for earnest and careful study, he wants to know the facts about it, and he seeks for the best things that have been said concerning it. Public libraries are established to subserve the purpose of the seeker for the truth, but even the best libraries cannot always afford the facilities for getting just what one wants without involving much laborious effort. Professional men have to resort, as well, to other methods of gathering information on special lines. The most resourceful public speakers and teachers not only use libraries, but they clip, collect, and classify material from every reliable source upon all subjects in which they are specially interested. Originality does not consist alone in discovering new truth, but in the presentation of old truth in a new way. The great thoughts of great minds stimulate us to better thinking; hence, if we would interest others in great themes, we must have resources upon which to draw for information and inspiration. The *Topical Excerpt Library* is the result of the labors of a busy man, during many busy years, who, in connection with his ministerial duties, has been gleaning, and saving for his own use, the best that he has found in periodicals and other public prints upon the greatest subjects with which man is concerned." The author had not contemplated publishing the results of his labors, but friends who had

been convinced of the efficiency of his method prevailed on him to do so.—In the five volumes which are mentioned above 239 different authors are cited in a total of 338 selections. The authors favored most are Wm. A. Quaile, Newell Dwight Hillis, A. J. Gordon, T. DeWitt Talmage, John Clifford, Chas. H. Spurgeon, J. H. Jowett, P. S. Henson, H. W. Beecher. The principle which has guided the selections for this *Library* is not apparent, else we should expect to see more of some authors quoted and less of others. The selections are mostly clippings from religious journals, also from the *Brooklyn Eagle* and the *Outlook*. The Lutheran Church is represented in the list of papers by the *Lutheran Observer*, but we have found no prominent Lutheran writer represented in the excerpts.—The excerpts represent every shade of religious belief. Gordon's presentation of the atonement from 2 Cor. 5, 14 is good (1, 3), but Harnack's "Thoughts on Redemption," which denies the wrath of God, robs the death of Christ of its legal aspect. (1, 62.) Fairbairn's "Influence of the Study of Other Religions on Christian Theology" holds that "the doctrine of original sin has during most of this century been slowly dying, partly because of the irrational and impossible forms in which it has been stated, partly because there was wanting a solid intellectual basis on which it could be built up." This article, too, rejects the purpose of atoning for sins which was believed to have prompted the offering of sacrifices, because in this view of the matter "there is expressed a notion of God and what pleases Him which turns Him into something less and worse than a vindictive man." (2, 137. 140.) Jonathan Edwards may deserve censure for his lurid pictures of hell; but the critic, L. L. Taylor, exposes himself to just suspicion as regards the motive of his criticism, when he says: "The half has not been told when the gospel is presented as nothing but a plan of salvation for the individual sinner. . . . The love light of the gospel is bound to be obscured by giving undue prominence to the retribution from which it would save us." (2, 252.) It is needless to multiply statements of this character. The collection contains a good deal of illustrative matter, for which the builder of sermons occasionally is grateful, though this sort of material never can figure prominently in a good Christian sermon. But the chief value of this collection, in our judgment, lies in the fact that it shows what a great many men who have risen to prominence in the church visible have dared, or risked, to say on vital matters of our religion. The pity of it is that such utterances can procure prominence. We could not even palliate many of the utterances by the proverbial *Quod decet Jovem*.

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XV.

OCTOBER, 1911.

No. 4.

WALTHER THE LUTHERAN.

(Continued.)

When one surveys the work of Walther's first year as editor, one is constrained to say that the promises made before *Der Lutheraner* made its appearance were faithfully kept. Koesterling¹⁾ relates that before publishing his church-paper Walther had submitted the following prospectus to a few pastors with whom he was acquainted:—

The aim of this paper shall be, 1. to acquaint men with the doctrine, treasures, and history of the Lutheran Church; 2. to prove that the Lutheran Church is not a sect, but the true Church of Christ; 3. to arouse love for the Lutheran Church; 4. to warn against, uncover, and refute false doctrine, to reveal those who falsely employ the Lutheran name for the purpose of spreading unbelief, misbelief, and enthusiastic notions, to repel attacks upon Lutheran doctrine, and to remove existing prejudices against our Church; 5. to unite the isolated members of our Church, to bring back into our Church those who have fallen away from it, and to prove that our Church is not extinct, yea, that it never can become extinct; 6. to put into the hands of Lutheran ministers a means for making plain to their congregations certain issues which can be thoroughly explained and urgently presented to them in no other way; 7. to counteract separatistic tendencies, to comfort and strengthen those who are in doubt and saddened because of the ruin of the Church, and to show them that there is nothing to compel them to fly into the arms of the sects which seem to prosper so greatly; 8. to rebuke dead orthodoxism, every sinful and ruinous movement with which we are being threatened, especially avarice, worldliness, misapplication of liberty, etc.; 9. to offer information regarding the present condition of the Lutheran

1) *Auswanderung der saechsischen Lutheraner*, etc., p. 113 f.

Church. The guiding principle of this paper shall be, as follows: Every article must be submitted to a test by means of the Holy Scriptures as they are explained in the Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and even such novel views as are not in direct contradiction to the Scriptures and the Confessions shall not be evolved in our paper, because they might easily excite strife and beget error among Lutherans. The character of this paper shall be as follows: 1. As far as possible every article shall be written in popular style, and the paper is not to contain learned stuff ("gelehrten Kram"); 2. it is to be edifying, not indulging in strife of words and offensive personalities; 3. it is to be of general interest to every lover of the Lutheran truth; 4. it is to be frank and firm, not inclined to make false concessions, nor sacrificing the least particle of truth for the sake of charity and peace; 5. it is not to meddle with political affairs, or such as do not concern the interest of the Lutheran Church; possible advertisements from which Lutherans might derive a benefit shall be excepted; 6. it is to breathe the spirit of love and tolerance; it is to pity and instruct rather than to thunder and fulminate; it is to bear in mind that the invisible Church is everywhere; 7. when errorists are attacked, every charge must rest upon an unquestioned basis of fact and truth; opponents must never be given cause to say justly, We do not teach the doctrine for which you attack us.

From the financial point of view this program did not promise great results. As a business venture one would have to pronounce it a reckless undertaking. Walther at no time in his life was a rich man. His journalistic enterprise was badly secured in a commercial way. It was mainly backed by his spirit of boundless self-sacrifice and by the promise of aid from his congregation. That promise could not amount to very much in any great emergency; for, although the Saxon immigrants had been a fairly well-to-do society when they landed at St. Louis, their goods had been wasted by shocking mismanagement. The early days in the colony were days of penury and want. When one bears in mind these unfavorable premises, the act of publishing *Der Lutheraner* looms up as an act of spiritual heroism, and its success is another proof and illustration of the mighty power innate in the truth of God's Word, — a power which prevails over and against the most forbidding odds.

Opinions on Walther's paper were divided, and after the first year's work these opinions had crystallized into the form which they retain to this day. There were men who were heartily disgusted with the constant appeals of *Der Lutheraner* to the Lutheran Confessions, with its relentless criticism of un-Lutheran practices of individual pastors and congregations and entire church bodies, and with its continued exhibition of the superiority of former conditions in the Lutheran Church over those prevailing at the present time. To these people Walther's distinct Lutheran emphasis boded nothing but evil. It sounded to them like the speech of a bigot, to hear of the heritage of pure teaching that had been entrusted to the Lutheran Church, of the evil of false teaching, of the conscientious duty of every sincere believer in the truth of Scripture to resist error by word and act. They had for generations been accustomed to a *manus manum lavat* policy as regards their interdenominational relations. Insistence on any particular form of teaching as the only Scriptural one, to the exclusion of any other as false, seemed to augur conceit and arrogance to them, and some did not hesitate to say that these "Altlutheraner" were Crypto-Romanists, and their system of teaching and church-government contained a papistic leaven. The Stephan episode was being cited as evidence to show what fruits would be matured under this system.

Much of this criticism, indeed, emanated from sheer ignorance of the teachings and principles of Lutheranism. The Lutheran Confessions had not been studied. There were Lutheran ministers who had not even seen a copy of the Book of Concord, much less had read and pondered its contents. Add to this that Walther had but recently arrived in this country, whose citizens have ever prided themselves on their freedom and independence in thought and action, and that, hence, Walther's doctrinal determination was regarded as a German trait, and it is not surprising to hear his earnest effort in behalf of genuine Lutheranism denounced as "foreign," "un-American."

But there were others—and their number was rapidly increasing with every issue of *Der Lutheraner*—who were just

as outspoken in their praises of Walther's journal. Many of them had not been heard of before in any prominent connection in the affairs of the American Lutheran Church. They seem to have been quiet persons who were doing the Church's work in a quiet way, saddened perhaps by the gloomy prospects ahead for Lutheranism as they viewed them, submitting resignedly to conditions which they felt themselves unable to alter, or hoping against hope for a better day. These were now seen coming out of their retirement. It is said Wyneken actually leaped for joy when he received his first copy of *Der Lutheraner* and exclaimed, "God be praised, there are still Lutherans in America!" (Wyneken was making a hopeless fight for Lutheran teaching in the General Synod. At one time he presented a resolution to that effect; it was listened to with great amusement, and in the printed report of the meeting at which this occurred his resolution was called "funny.") Walther received encouraging communications from all parts of the country. It became customary to report deviations from Lutheran teaching and practice by Lutherans in his paper, and men who were dissatisfied with un-Lutheran conditions in their own body published their complaints in *Der Lutheraner*. Congregations whose faithful pastors were being maligned appealed to Walther for protection, and he published their statements in his paper. *Der Lutheraner* became the rallying center for the quickened Lutheran conscience in America and the unofficial organ of little bands of men scattered through Missouri, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, New York, and Maryland. The early volumes of *Der Lutheraner* are intensely interesting literature, whether they are studied from the view-point of the Lutheran church-historian or the Lutheran confessionalist. Walther's paper was proving a mighty precipitant: wherever it was thrown into muddied Lutheran waters, impurities began to settle, and the waters were being clarified.

It is worth while to hear Walther relate his experience as an editor. In his "Foreword" to the second volume of *Der Lutheraner*, on September 6, 1845, he writes as follows:—

When we assumed the publication of this journal a year ago, we did not by any means do so from a consciousness of our qualification for such an enterprise. We rather felt as one feels when a conflagration starts somewhere: if there are no strong men on the spot, even the weakest feels himself called upon to hurry and render such aid as he can. Thus the stress in which we found our dear Evangelical Lutheran Church also in this country emboldened us to come out publicly with our feeble testimony in her behalf. In so doing, we relied upon the gracious assistance of Him who regards those of low estate; and we were not only fully assured of the energetic cooperation which a few brethren in the faith had promised us, but we were also hoping quietly that it would not be a long time that we would have to conduct, with our unskilled arm, this battle in behalf of the most momentous and sacred affair, the pure, divine truth, and that soon some one better qualified and trained for this work would feel himself urged to take our place and to show that what we had so feebly defended is nevertheless, and will remain, the unconquerable truth.

As regards the first two reasons for our confidence at the beginning of our little enterprise, our hope has not been deceived. God has graciously assisted us, and we have not been put to shame with our feeble testimony. For this His holy name be praised and blessed for evermore! Our esteemed coworkers, too, have fulfilled their promises, and the prompt issuance of our paper is primarily due to their contributions. Nor must we fail to mention to the glory of God that the members of our local Evangelical Lutheran congregation have gladly made sacrifices, thus enabling us, in spite of the small number of subscribers at the beginning, to continue our paper as a means for professing our common faith. But while we should gladly have turned our *Lutheraner* over to an abler editor, and while we should certainly expect an increase of subscribers and greater efficiency for our paper under a new editor, still our endeavors to obtain one have proved fruitless. On the contrary, esteemed friends have encouraged us to continue our paper under our editorial signature. Accordingly, as long as the Lord is pleased to grant us His grace, we shall not refuse to conduct the management of this little enterprise. We commend it to His care, for whose glory it was undertaken.

Before closing this foreword, we deem it necessary to explain the aim and character of *Der Lutheraner*, that is, its real purpose and the principles by which we are guided in editing it. It appears that not a few persons have been offended because *Der Lutheraner* contains not many contributions of a purely devotional character, and publishes chiefly polemical articles. For this reason some have not

hesitated to charge us publicly with quarrelsomeness and to actually oppose us as an enemy of practical Christianity. Accordingly, we make the following statement once for all time.

While we do not assume to pass judgment on the editors of Christian journals who pursue as their chief aim that of devotion, and while we cordially rejoice at every good result attained by such efforts, still for our part we are convinced that we ought not to habituate Christians to devote that time which should be given to the daily edification of their souls chiefly to the reading of a newspaper, often quite a voluminous one. Even when we leave out of the account the unedifying character of many contributions purporting to be edifying, we hold nevertheless that, upon the whole, the multitude of purely devotional articles, mostly small as to size, which are published by many religious journals, cannot but dissipate the mind of the reader and create in him a certain spiritual fastidiousness; it is not possible that these articles could serve the purpose of giving to any soul a connected account of the entire counsel of God for our salvation, and thus to advance a person in knowledge step by step. Must not Christian journalists rather consider it their duty to guide their readers chiefly to a daily and diligent use of the Bible, and thus to draw the water of life from the fountain-head?—Moreover, the Christian Church possesses such an abundant supply of old books of devotion, full of substance, thorough, complete, spiritedly written, and revealing a high degree of experience, that one is inclined in our day, when such fathers in Christ as the authors of those books were are vainly sought, to remind every one of what is said in Eccl. 12, 12: "My son, be admonished: of making of books there is no end." As regards the promotion of devotional interests by means of books, we for our part believe that the best we could do would be to republish and urgently recommend to all Christians such excellent works, before others, as those of Luther, Brentius, Jerome Weller, Martin Chemnitz, Johann Gerhard, J. Arnd, Heinrich Mueller, Sriver, and others.²⁾ It is our humble

2) It is to be regretted that Luther's writings are least in the hands of the common people, because after their first publication they have usually been published in entire editions and not in selections. Accordingly, the entire works of Luther were bought only by professional men, and, as a rule, are now decaying in their libraries. Of America it is needless to speak in this connection. It is manifest that in America there prevails an ignorance, even among Lutherans, of the writings of Luther that cannot be sufficiently bewailed. For in America it is not a startling occurrence at all when even "Lutheran" writers, in their ignorance of what Luther has written, proclaim him now a rationalist, now a sacramentarian, now a half-fledged semi-papist. Unless, therefore, the writings

opinion that, while we have these precious guides to genuine, vital Christianity, there is no need of our publishing books for general devotion, yea, that we ought to put forth strenuous endeavors that the sterling books afore-named, and others like them, may not be forgotten, or supplanted by modern books composed in a spirit of self-elected piety and not emanating from a profound spiritual experience.

As regards *doctrine*, the case is different. New defenses for doctrine must be provided because new attacks are ever and again made upon it, new adulterations of it are being attempted, or ancient heresies are dressed out in a new garb and paraded. Accordingly, in future issues of *Der Lutheraner* we shall continue to keep this as our chief aim before our eyes, *viz.*, to promote the knowledge of the true *doctrine*, and to serve our readers in these days so full of pitfalls as a guide that is constantly at their side, warning them against unbelief and misbelief, such as numerous false prophets in our day are proclaiming in speech and writing. All the uncharitable judgments to which we have had to submit in the past, and may have to submit in the future, shall not swerve us from our purpose. By the grace of God we know, on the one hand, what a precious treasure pure, unadulterated teaching is, and that nothing but such teaching can be the true foundation for genuine unfeigned godliness; on the other hand, we are conscious of having written nothing from quarrelsomeness or vainglory, nor in a vindictive spirit, but from pure love of the truth which God has kindled in us, and for the salvation of our erring brethren. Finally, we are comforted by the reflection that we are not alone, but in our battling we have for our guides and patterns all the holy prophets and apostles, yea, Christ, the most holy

of Luther are again placed into the hands of the common people, there is reason to fear that ultimately the poor people in our country will in good faith accept as Lutheran anything that is being offered them under that name, even if it is something which Luther in his day with holy zeal has combated as a fatal error. Accordingly, we cannot pass by this opportunity to call the attention of our readers, and especially of our brethren in the ministry, to the call for subscriptions, herewith renewed, for a reprint of Luther's House Postil. This call appeals to all who are concerned about the dissemination of Lutheran teaching, and reminds them what a treasure they would bring into their congregations if they were to induce their members to purchase this valuable book. — Two years ago both the Church Postil and the House Postil were to have been published at Buffalo, but the noble enterprise, we regret to state, was wrecked upon the rock of Lutheran indifference, both among laymen and ministers. God grant that this new endeavor at New York may not prove abortive, for our humiliation.

Son of God Himself; for these, while they were actuated by the greatest love, have nevertheless manifested a most solemn zeal in opposing errorists and every deviation from the revealed truths, and have unto their death fought against them in their sermons and writings. We shall gladly continue to follow them, not heeding the unfavorable judgments which are being passed on our endeavor by the world and such as are its kith, and striving only for this that we may be found a faithful steward.

We repeat, however, that we shall never fail to remember that it behooves us more than others to appear before the public in unfeigned humility and modesty, because we were formerly walking errors' ways ourselves. But our personal experience of the pernicious influence which even such an error as had been joined with self-elected humility and self-denial can exert on our whole life in time and eternity, obligates us all the more to testify against error wherever we may find it, and wherever there is the least prospect that our testimony may produce a good result.

We shall consider our humble labor abundantly rewarded if God continues to bless *Der Lutheraner*, to the end that by its contents here or there some one may have the conviction quickened in him that purity of teaching is an important matter, or that some one may be strengthened in this conviction.

A year later, on September 5, 1846, Walther writes in the same place as follows:—

With the present number we begin the third volume of our journal. We confess that we do this with a joy such as we did not experience at the beginning of the two previous volumes. Not as though our reliance upon our own efficiency had waxed stronger; the cause of our joy is rather this, that we are plainly beholding how the Lord Himself is prospering the cause which this little paper of ours would like to serve in its humble way.

For there is no doubt that God has arisen to remove the rubbish under which our dear Evangelical Lutheran Church in America lay buried a long time. What was the state of affairs in our country a few years ago, and what is it now? There were but a few calling themselves Lutheran, who knew the true Lutheran doctrine, and still less there were who professed and defended it. The Book of Concord, which contains the public confessions of our Church, was not even known by name, much less by its contents, among most of the Lutherans in our country. Very few persons possessed any of the writings of Luther. The majority of the ministers still calling themselves Lutheran had adopted the Zwinglian-Reformed errors (for example, regarding the Lord's Supper, Baptism, Absolution, Original Sin, etc.), and many of these had also adopted the practice of the

Methodists, the so-called "new measures." Accordingly, the majority of our congregations were not united in the one Lutheran faith, but they were mixed societies, composed of Lutherans and Reformed. In these congregations Books of Forms (Agenden) and hymn-books had been introduced that were made to suit an unbeliever or a follower of a false faith as much as a believer. Briefly, while the Lutheran Church in America had not lapsed into such crass infidelity and such plain paganism as it had nearly everywhere in Germany, still it had fallen away from the faith, had faithlessly deserted the banner of the Confessions under which the fathers had fought, had cast away the precious legacy of the pure doctrine confided to her, had contaminated itself by spiritual adultery, by fellowship with all the sects, and had not retained anything Lutheran but—the name. In spite of this awful state of affairs most Lutherans in America cherished the belief that all was quite well with them. For, they said, our ministers are not rationalists; we are conducting many prayer-meetings; occasionally we effect conversions, and so on. Like the Laodiceans of old, the Lutherans in America were in the habit of saying: "I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing," Rev. 3, 14—19. And although the most varying shades of teaching and belief prevailed among those who called themselves Lutheran, still they were living in mutual peace as profound as among the dead in a graveyard. (1 Thess. 5, 3; comp. Ezek. 13.) Nobody interfered with another; a person might hold whatever views he pleased, he was accounted a brother beloved, provided he sang the common song of all.

In a general view, such was the condition of the Lutheran Church in our country a few years ago. If any one thinks this sketch overdrawn, let him read the epistle recently sent to Germany by the so-called General Synod of the American Lutheran Church in the name of 320 Lutheran ministers and 726 Lutheran congregations, and he will there find the defection which we have portrayed shamelessly professed and heralded as a progressive achievement.³⁾

3) In connection with the above the acknowledgment which the *Lutheran Standard* has made may be compared. See *Lutheraner*, vol. 2, No. 14. (This is the statement of Editor Spielmann to which we referred in the April issue at the end of the first article.) Also the treatise by B. Kurz, "Why are you a Lutheran?" the "Portraiture of Lutheranism" by S. Schmucker, and lastly, the "Lutherische Hirtenstimme." (This was a rationalistic publication of Rev. Weyl, of Baltimore.) This paper has, under its Lutheran signature, incessantly expectorated its venomous froth against the true Lutheran doctrine, and yet is regarded as the organ of a considerable part of the Lutheran Church,—thus evidencing the awful defection of the American Lutheran Church.

Over and against this, what has come to pass? Since a few years ago voices have been raised, now here, now there, in defense of the truth that had been surrendered, and in opposition to the error that had been espoused. To begin with, Prof. Schmidt, in his *Kirchenzeitung*, raised his voice to denounce the defection which had taken place, and called attention to the Confessions of our Church and to the most important of the polemical writings of Luther against the Reformed, from which he published excerpts. He was soon followed by others who made use of the *Kirchenzeitung* to witness against the pernicious evils which had arisen, and to summon men to purge our Church from her errors. These were joined two years ago by *Der Lutheraner*, which paper likewise made it its task to reveal departures in teaching and practice which had occurred, and to point out the necessity of a sincere return to the principles of the Reformation. Pastor Wyneken was moved by the misery of the German Lutherans in America to go to Germany and present the condition of our Church to brethren of the faith orally and in writing, appealing to them for aid. Lo and behold! all these efforts have not been in vain. The former lethargy is a thing of the past; a healthy movement has arisen. Many upright persons who for a long time had secretly mourned the ruin of the Church which they had recognized, but had despaired of a general improvement of existing conditions, now conceived courage and came forward. Others, who had heretofore regarded the prevailing state of affairs as a desirable one, have had their eyes opened and are horrified, and now are gladly joining the ranks of those who desire a reformation. Others have been convicted by the testimony of the truth, and now begin to feel ashamed of the position which they have occupied. True, they still are viewing the witnesses that have arisen with suspicion; however, they are quietly beginning to put away the error with which they have been charged. Others are still standing undecided at the parting of the ways, but they are at variance with themselves and roused out of their former security. A general interest in doctrinal matters, which had become nearly extinct, has been aroused again. Luther's writings are being dug up from the dust in which they have lain moldering; they are being republished and put into the hands of the laity.⁴⁾ The confessional writings of our Church are emerging from the night which covered them into

4) Our readers are aware that Luther's House Postil has been published in an excellent edition this year by Mr. Ludwig in New York City. A hopeful sign, too, amongst others, is this, that the English Lutheran Tennessee Synod has had the important letter of Luther, "Of the Anabaptists," reprinted, and issues the same as an appendix to its latest annual report.

the light of day; people cease more and more being ashamed of them; they are read again, readers of church-papers are having their attention called to them, they are partly republished, and appeals are made to them.⁵⁾ It seems as if the carnal peace in which men have been slumbering so sweetly can no longer be maintained. A great war has broken out, which is becoming more general day by day. Everywhere divisions are taking place; at the same time there is manifested among the orthodox a determined desire for most intimate union. Evidently we are on the threshold of a most important and, we firmly trust to God, most salutary crisis for our Church.

True, the men who are now battling to restore the Lutheran Church to her original form, especially as regards doctrine, still are as a drop in the bucket compared with the men who are fighting against them. But no matter how few they are in number, no matter what sneers, derision, and persecution their society may have to suffer, no matter what efforts are being made to render them suspected to the people and to represent them, against better knowledge and conviction, as a new sect that is secretly planning to lead the Lutherans back to Rome, no matter if men call them Old Lutherans, Puseyites, or even secret Jesuits,—we are not afraid. The Spirit of Lies may rave ever so much, the *Lord* has nevertheless arisen for the defense of His Church. Neither numbers, nor might, nor cunning, nor lies, nor calumnies, can check Him. He will accomplish His work with His almighty power. Truth will conquer, and the *enemies* of the truth will be confounded. Amen.

It is truly refreshing to observe the modesty of Walther in his willingness to share with others whatever credit there was due to men for the remarkable change that was gradually, but surely coming over the American Lutheran Church. His, after all, had been yeoman's service in the cause of restoring Lutheranism to its former glory. He continued the work when others laid down their weapons; yea, he increased his efficiency as a warrior for the truth with the advance of years and the increase of his followers. Greater results than those indicated in this article were to follow from his unflinching and ever-consistent testimony for the righteous cause of God's Word and Luther's doctrine pure.

(*To be continued.*)

5) This is done in the *Lutheran Standard*. This paper reports that the Ohio Synod will unite with the Tennessee Synod in an effort to publish the entire Book of Concord in English.

ROMANISM A PLAGIARISM ON PAGANISM.

Father Vaughan of London, at the Eucharistic celebration at Montreal, 1910, said it was "the genius of Protestantism to invent a would-be religion." (*Lit. Dig.*, Sept. 24, 1910.) Cardinal Logue of Ireland said at St. Patrick's Cathedral, in New York City, on October 11, 1910, "I never could see how any intelligent Christian could oppose Catholicism." (*N. Y. Tribune*, Oct. 24, 1910.) Archbishop Ryan said at the dedication of St. Patrick's that the "Catholic faith is superior to all creeds." (*Lit. Dig.*, Oct. 22, 1910.) Mr. Quinn O'Brien of Chicago said to the Knights of Columbus at the Milwaukee Auditorium, on October 12, 1910, "that not sufficient interest is shown by Catholics in the Bible. Protestantism corrected abuses in the Catholic Church of the Middle Ages. It has done much for the intellects of men of the present day." He called upon the knights to throw wide the church portals to let the Protestants come in, since "Protestantism has run its course and served its purpose." (*Milw. Free Press*, Oct. 13, 1910.)

Mr. Quinn O'Brien is quite sincere, no doubt, and we thank him heartily for his kind invitation. We must decline the same, however, for not quite all abuses in the Catholic Church have been corrected, as we purpose to show in the following pages. While we do that, we shall also, at the same time, indirectly pay our respects to the three other speakers quoted in the beginning.

The heathen called the early Christians atheists. Why? Because they had no temples, altars, priests, sacrifices, nor anything of that ceremonial and ritual in which the vulgar commonly see the essence of religion. But in course of time all the pagan pomp was introduced by the Romanists.

For three hundred years the heathen could always say to the Christian, "You have no right to exist"—*Non licet esse vos*. (Tertullian, *Apol.*, c. 4.) The sword of Damocles hung over every Christian's neck, and sometimes it came down in terrible persecutions, commonly counted ten.

It was not natural for hypocrites to join the Christians

during these centuries, and so the Church remained fairly pure in doctrine and holy in life. But when the Emperor Constantine, in 312, declared for Christianity and repressed paganism, Christianity became fashionable and profitable, and so it was natural for many pagans to come into the Church and to retain their paganism in belief and in life.

The Roman Catholic Lord Acton and many others have spoken in language of the strongest reprehension of the superstition of the early Church. It begins about the middle of the third century; we see it first distinctly in Cyprian, Novatian, and Gregory Thaumaturgus; and in the fourth century it is strongly marked. Gregory Thaumaturgus, the pupil of Origen, and many others, sanctioned practices of which they did not approve, in order to make it easier for the heathen to come over to Christianity, and the ignorant converts sensibly lowered the tone of the whole body. Paulinus of Nola followed the same policy in the fourth century in Campania. "The church-ale was so like the heathen festival that it was really the same thing." (Bigg, pp. 83. 84.)

About the year 400, Vigilantius of Gaul, a very early pioneer of Luther, vigorously attacked superstitious practices, notably relic worship and the vigils in the basilicas of the martyrs.

Augustine, about the same time, also grieves bitterly over the popular superstition which led the crowds to kneel in adoration before the tombs of the saints, and writes against "imitating the pagans here, who adore the dead."

So corrupt had the "Christians" of the Roman empire become that Salvian of Marseilles, about 450, thought the barbarian Goths more worthy to be the masters of the world. "Their modesty purifies the earth all stained by Roman debauchery."

Ammianus Marcellinus, Jerome, and Chrysostom also write against the Roman rottenness. Fervid Roman Catholic though he is, the scholarly Montalambert, in his *Monks of the West*, strongly endorses the conclusions of Salvian when he describes

the Roman empire without the barbarians as "an abyss of servitude and corruption." (Spence, pp. 491. 506.)

In Italy they observed the custom of setting out food for the dead four days before the feast of the Chair of St. Peter on February 18, the date of the ancient Feralia. (Burckhardt 2, 283.)

From the letters and poems of Paulinus of Nola we see that to the Campanian peasant the local saint was often merely the local god with a thin Christian veneer.

Eusebius observed the "unspeakable hypocrisy" of those who had crept into the church. In 493, Pope Gelasius forbade Christians celebrating the Lupercalia, one of the most licentious heathen festivals. In 625, the Council of Rheims punished Christians for taking part in heathen observances.

The 5th canon of the Council of Clovesho condemned various "paganiae," such as "auguries, divinations, incantations, and profane sacrifices, which were performed in adjoining churches . . . under the name of holy martyrs and confessors." Also the Council of Lestines (743).

Faustus rebukes the Catholics for carrying on the heathen ceremonies. "Their sacrifices indeed you have turned into Christian feasts; their idols into martyrs, whom, with like vows you worship; you appease the shades of the dead with wine and meals; you celebrate the Gentiles' solemn days with them;—of their life, certainly you have changed naught."

In 531, the Emperor Justinian issued an edict commanding all pagans to receive baptism, on pain of exile and confiscation of all their property, within three months; and this was no dead letter.

In Mesopotamia the conversion of the governor of a city was followed at once by the conversion of all the inhabitants. In Asia Minor Bishop John baptized 70,000 converts. To save his life, Cyrus of Constantinople not only declared himself a Christian, but was ordained priest; Theodosius II made him bishop in Phrygia. He reached there at Christmas. Asked to preach, he said such a mystery is best celebrated in silence!

After the victory of Tolbiac, Clovis was baptized on Christmas Day, 496, and 3000 of his warriors with him. When Vladimir of Russia was baptized, the whole people of Kief plunged into the river, and the priests read the baptismal prayers from the bank. Augustine baptized 10,000 Angles on one Christmas Day. Bede tells us Retwald, King of East Anglia, had under one roof a Christian altar and a heathen altar. In Ireland chiefs were converted, and their whole tribes quietly accepted the new religion.

Gregory the Great starved peasants into Christianity; slaves were chastised into it; freemen were imprisoned; Jews were bribed into it by a 25 or 33 per cent. discount on their rent; in Istria he used soldiers to convert the people; he exhorted Ethelbert and Brunichildis to compel their heathen subjects to become Christians.

Pope Gregory instructed Augustine: "Whereas it is a custom among the Saxons to slay abundance of oxen and sacrifice them to the devil, you must not abolish that custom, but appoint a new festival to be kept either on the day of the consecration of the churches, or the birthday of the saints whose relics are deposited there, and on those days the Saxons may be allowed to make arbors round the temples changed into churches, to kill their oxen and to feast, as they did while they were pagans; only they shall offer their thanks and praises, not to the devil, but to God."

Aringhus, a Romish writer, says: "The Popes found it necessary, in the conversion of the gentiles, to dissemble and wink at many things and yield to the times, and not to use force against customs which the people are so obstinately fond of, nor to think of extirpating at once everything that had the appearance of profane."

Under Charles the Great multitudes of Saxons were baptized by force, falsely declaring, says the chronicler, that they desired to become Christians. For eating meat during Lent, death was inflicted. Norway was forcefully converted by Olaf Tryggvason and Olaf the Saint.

Lecky says: "Vast tribes of savages who had always been idolaters . . . and who for the most part had been converted, not by individual persuasion, but by the commands of their chiefs, embraced Christianity in such multitudes that their habits of mind soon became the dominating habits of the Church." Romanism gained the world and lost her soul.

In the XXIX. chapter of his "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," Gibbon shows how paganism crept into the Church. In his notes he shows that Faustus the Manichæan accuses the Catholics of idolatry, that M. de Beausobre admits the introduction of Christian idolatry in the fourth and fifth centuries, and that "the Imitation of Paganism" is the subject of Dr. Middleton's letter from Rome.

Bramante built at San Pietro in Montorio, over the blood of the martyr, a chapel in the light and cheerful form of a peripteros. (Ranke, *Popes*, p. 27.)

"On that cross I will throw up into the sky the Pantheon," said Michael Angelo. The pagan Pantheon on the Christian cross, that is St. Peter's Cathedral in Rome; the combination is a good illustration of the religion of Rome.

At the great central door of St. Peter's are the bronze gates of Filarete ordered by Pope Eugenius IV in envy of Ghiberti's at Florence, which are like prose to poetry. Side by side with our Lord, etc., are Venus in the arms of Mars, Europa raped by the Bull, Leda caressing the Swan, Jupiter and Ganymede! . Another good illustration of the religion of Rome.

"This is paganized Christianity," said a Roman prelate about the Cathedral of Orvieto, where heathen gods and Christian saints are represented side by side.

Gregorovius writes: "Pallavicini has bitterly upbraided Leo X because he preferred the fables of paganism to the doctrines of Christianity. . . . In Leo's age paganism seemed entirely to discard the vesture of Christianity, in which as imagination, sense of form, and polytheism, it had always survived among the Latins. Could a Roman of Cicero's time

have been present in the sixteenth century at the festival of one of the saints of the Church on whom the epithet of *Divus* had been bestowed, he would scarcely have discovered anything unfamiliar in his surroundings. In Roman sepulchral inscriptions God is again Jupiter,—Dante had already called him Sommo Giove,—and heaven again Olympus. The Conservators of Rome, who restored a cistern on the Capitol, inscribed on it like ancient Romans: ‘We have founded the vessel; do thou fill it, O Jupiter, with rain, and be gracious to the presidents of thy rock.’ The cardinals were called senators, the saints simply gods (*Dii* and *Deae*), and the deifying title of *Divus*, as that of *Optimus Maximus*, is usually bestowed on the popes. When Leo ascended the throne, the poet Janus Vitalis announced that Jupiter had again descended from Olympus to Rome, and that Leo Medici as Apollo would cure all the maladies of the time. Neither had Julius II been dismayed when one Good Friday a preacher had likened him to Zeus, and compared Christ to Decius or Curtius. . . . Paganism oozed through every pore of Catholicism. . . . Among the Latins the Christian religion had become petrified into a pagan service of the senses and of formulas. . . . The beloved pagans were transplanted into the glory of the heaven of the blessed, where they exchanged greetings with the Christian successors to their splendor. . . . Skepticism reigned universally. . . . Priests laughed among themselves, as in former days the augurs in ancient Rome, and allowed their hands to be reverently kissed by smiling laymen. . . . The papal censorship of the sixteenth century, after Leo X, persecuted not the abominable works of Aretino, but the writings of the serious-minded Flaminio, and Sadoletto’s treatise on the Epistle of Paul to the Romans was placed on the Index. . . . The most horrible of all authors, Pietro Aretino, even entertained hopes of the cardinal’s purple. . . . The state, wealth, luxury, and culture, all had been usurped by the priests. The annual revenues of many cardinals amounted to 30,000 ducats and upwards. . . . In the time of Clement VII the young cardinal Ippolito Medii

supported 300 poetasters in his palace. . . . In truth, the Rome of Julius II and Leo X resembled on a reduced scale the Rome of the Roman emperors. . . . "God be praised," wrote Cardinal Bibiena, "for we want nothing here but a court of women." In the time of Innocent VIII and Alexander VI illustrious women were boldly invited to the banquets at the Vatican. . . . No good woman could have moved voluntarily and at ease among the *monsignori*. . . . In Roman society the place of noble women was filled by mistresses and courtesans. Before he became cardinal, Bembo lived openly with the beautiful Venetian Morosina. Leo X showed no hesitation in attending the marriage of Agostino Chigi with his mistress Francesca. . . . Becadelli's theory, that courtesans occupy a more useful place than pious nuns was acted on in Rome. As the surname Romana had been given to the last saintly Roman woman in the time of Eugenius IV, so with equal national pride people now talked of a *Cortisana Romana*. We should inspire disgust, did we attempt to depict the unbounded vice of Roman society in the corrupt times of Leo X, or to lift the veil from the mysteries of the priesthood. The moral corruption of the age, one of the best of whose productions bore the title of 'Syphilis,' is sufficiently known. . . . Even before Luther or Hutten, Savonarola had described Rome as a sink of iniquity. . . . As a satirist it seemed even to Erasmus a great European carnival, where worldly vanity went masked in spiritual attire, where were represented all lusts and desires, all intrigues and crimes, their magnet the Vatican, and thirst for gold, honors, and power the forces that moved them. Sailing on this tumultuous sea, he seemed to behold Sebastian Brant's overcrowded 'Ship of Fools;' and, in fact, soon after his arrival in London, in 1509, he wrote his celebrated 'Praise of Folly' in the house of Thomas More. As a Christian he was astonished at the bold and glaring coloring borrowed from Paganism by the Roman religion, of which nothing remained that was not false, and whose formerly revered temple had been transformed by the ambition and rapacity of the priesthood into a European

banking house and a retail market for diplomas of favors, indulgences, and objects of superstition." (*Rome in Middle Ages*, vol. VIII, pt. 1, pp. 295—311.)

The learned Fra Colonna in Charles Reade's "The Cloister and the Hearth" eloquently astonishes the simple Dutch monk by pointing out the identity of many papal Roman customs with pagan Roman customs.

When the bigoted Romanist Linaere, under Henry VIII, fell in with a copy of the New Testament, he said, with an oath, "Either this book is not true, or we are not Christians."

When the Jesuits went to India, they stained their bodies, and swore that they were Brahmins, who could trace their pedigree to the god Brahma. In China the Jesuits taught that the doctrines of Confucius differed little or nothing from their own. (Wylie, p. 527.)

Dr. Sven Hedin, the famous Swedish explorer of Tibet, is the subject of angry attacks by Roman Catholic papers. In his book he says that many customs and ceremonies of the Buddhists in Tibet are very similar to those practiced by and in the Roman Catholic Church. He mentions the rosaries, the monks, and the nuns, the worship and the pope-like Dalai Lama.

"A Modernist's Letter to Pius X" asks: "Where is there aught of the religion of Jesus? How discover beneath this pagan superstition and Pharisaic formalism a single element . . . of spiritual worship? How does it differ from the revolving barrel of the Buddhist, or the mummery of a medicine-man?" (p. 96. 138.) The writer was formerly a Paulist Father and professor at the Catholic Georgetown University at Washington, D. C.

PONTIFEX MAXIMUS.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus says the Pontifex Maximus "has a sovereign control in all the most weighty affairs, judging all cases relating to sacred things, as also those between private individuals. He enacts new laws on his own authority in causes for which those in being do not provide."

As a rule, the Pontifex was also Emperor. In processions

he was carried in a gilded ivory carrying-chair, surrounded by the Sacred College and Senate. In front is borne the sword of state, emblem of imperialism. He is garbed in white, "of all hues most pleasing to the gods" (Cicero), richly decked with golden plates and many jewels; around his head are waved, on long thin stems, ostrich and peacock feathers; doves and other birds are let loose.

The Emperor Gratian would not have the title and the homage as unfit for a Christian. The Pope took the heathen title and worship and introduced this heathenism into Romanism. When Luther was in Rome, he saw Julius II in such a procession.

The Roman emperor and Pontifex Maximus Caligula decreed that subjects coming into his presence should kiss his foot. This aroused keen indignation; the *optimi* declared it an insult to liberty and a piece of Persian slavery. (Seneca.)

This pagan custom was introduced by Pope Gregory VII, and the proudest papist is proud to kiss the Pope's toe.

The "Pastoral Staff" of the Romish bishop is simply the "Lituus" of Romulus and the augurs. It seems to be of Babylonish origin; one was carried by Assur Nasir Pal, 880 B. C.

At Lhassa the Buddhists have had an infallible Dalai Lama for many centuries, just as the papists have an infallible Pope at Rome—since 1870.

THE ROSARY.

In India many spend hours in simply repeating the name of a god. In order to keep count of the number of times such a prayer is repeated, a string of 108 seeds is used, a rosary. So many times the text must be repeated; if done oftener, it is a work of merit, of supererogation, a surplus that can be transferred to another.

Mohammedans use a rosary to count the "Ninety-nine Beautiful Names of Allah." St. Peter Damiani, who died in 1072, mentions as something strange that some clergymen repeated daily the prayer, "Hail, Mary, full of grace!" Bishop Odo of Paris, about 1200, recommends to the priests to hold

the people to recite the "Hail, Mary!" as well as the Lord's Prayer and the Creed. (Bain, 132.)

Though Christ says, "Use not vain repetitions as the heathen do," the Romanists have introduced this heathen superstition of "telling their beads" (Anglo-Saxon *bede*, prayer; a *bedesman* is one paid to pray for another). Pope Sixtus V, in 1587, granted an indulgence of fifty days to Christians as often as they salute others with the words, "Praised be Jesus Christ!" and as many to him who devoutly answers, "Amen." He also granted twenty-five days indulgence to those who simply repeat the name Jesus. Etc., etc. These promises were confirmed in 1728 by Benedict XIII.

In course of time the "Hail, Mary!" took the place of the Lord's Prayer to a great extent. At the times of the crusades Peter of Amiens brought the rosary from the East and introduced it in the West, 1094—1095.

Jacob Sprenger, the well-known Grand Inquisitor of Germany in 1475, founded the first Confraternity of the Rosary in the Dominican church in Cologne, in order to save the city from the troubles of war. Pope Sixtus IV granted it the privilege of hundred days' indulgence; three years after it was lengthened to seven years. Leo X, in 1520, granted still greater purgatorial privileges. The victory of Lepanto, of John of Austria, over the Turks, in 1571, was ascribed to the rosary, and the first Sunday in October was made the Festival of the Rosary, and this soon became universal. (Bain, *Devel.*, 134.)

PURGATORY.

The Persians believed in a cleansing fire which would in time burn up all evil. In India the god of fire, Agni, is the purifier, and the Hindus are burned to ashes to be freed from all impurity. At the entrance to their temples the Buddhists have pictures showing people suffering the torments of hell, whither all must go for a time to be purified, unless one's "merit" is greater than one's sin. If the price is paid, the priest arranges a speedy passage from hell to heaven, or even a direct entrance to heaven, without the purgatory. Plato

teaches that before going to heaven some must first go to an underground place to suffer the punishment they have deserved. In heathen Rome it was the common creed that the heavenly fields could be reached only through a purgatory. In Virgil's *Aeneid* Anchises explains to Aeneas how souls are purified in purgatory.

Though the Bible knows no purgatory, the Roman Catholic Church has adopted this pagan notion. The Creed of Pope Pius IV says: "I constantly hold that there is a purgatory, that the souls therein detained are assisted by the suffrages of the faithful."

As to the place; Eckius will have it to be at the bottom of the sea, some will have it in Mount Etna, and Bernardus de Bustis in a hill in Ireland.

As to the torments; Sir Thomas More will have them to be only by fire; but Fisher, his fellow-sufferer, by fire and by water.

As to the executioners; Bishop Fisher will have them to be holy angels, but Sir Thomas More to be the very devils.

As to the sins; some will have them to be venial only, others say mortal too.

As to the time; Dionysius the Carthusian extends it to the end of the world, whilst Dominicus a Soto limits it to ten years; and others make it depend on the number of masses done on their behalf, or if the Pope but speak the word.

As to the torments; Aquinas makes them as violent as those of hell, but the Rhemists say the souls there are in a very fine condition.

O'Sullivan's *Catholic History of Ireland* thus describes the Purgatory of St. Patrick: "There are numbers of men whom no arithmetic can reckon up, all lying on the ground pierced through the body. They uttered hoarse cries of agony, their tongues cleaving to their jaws. They were buffeted by violent tempests, and shattered by repeated blows of devils. The devils drove them into another plain, horrible with exquisite tortures. Some, with iron chains about their necks and

limbs, were suspended over fires, others were burned with red-hot cinders. Not a few were transfixed on the spits, and roasted, melted lead being poured into them. Alas for those who do not do penance in this world!"

From such torments souls could be helped by paying priests to say mass, *i. e.*, to sacrifice Christ over and over.

"In the Archdiocese of Vienna, in 1787, the number of masses for the dead was 97,000, requiring more than 300 priests daily to perform them. In the one church of St. John and St. Paul, in Venice, the unperformed masses due at that time amounted to 16,400." A mint of money!

HOLY WATER.

The Hindus believe in the soul-cleansing power of water, and they bathe daily in the sacred rivers, and on certain holy days at certain places all sins, past, present, and future, are washed away, even the sins of the bathers' ancestors. At the coming of death the sick are taken to the banks of a sacred river, that the sight of the holy water might cleanse the soul, and afford a passport to heaven.

At the entrance to the temples of Greece and Rome there was the Amula, a vessel of holy water, where the worshiper might sprinkle himself. This water was made holy by putting into it a burning torch from the altar, representing the god of fire, or by putting salt into it.

When the heathen temples were turned into Christian churches, these lavens with the holy water were kept, and so this heathen superstition crept into the Roman Catholic Church. Some of this water is made holy on the Saturday after Good Friday, and is used for baptism and for sprinkling over the congregation. The priest divides the water in the font with his hand in the form of a cross, and then expels the evil spirits. Letting down the great Paschal candle into the water, he breathes into it three times, a little oil and a little saliva is also mixed with the water, and now this water is holy and has power to cleanse the soul from sin.

Pythagoras says, "Sea water or salt and water washes

away the sins of men." Herodotus speaks often of its common use. Justin Martyr wrote about 166: "It was invented by devils in imitation of the true baptism." Julian ordered all food brought to the market to be sprinkled with lustral water, that the Christians might either starve or be compelled to eat what they considered demoniacally polluted.

Platina says Pope Alexander I (109—119) introduced this pagan superstition.

Though the Bible knows nothing of such holy water, this heathen superstition was introduced into Romanism. "Father Newman himself admits, in regard to holy water and many other things that were the 'very instruments and appendages of demon worship,' that they were all of pagan origin, and sanctified by adoption into the Church." And Jodocus Tiletanus of Convaine says: "There are divers matters of importance and weight accepted and received, out of a doctrine which is nowhere set forth in writing (of the Bible). For we do bless the water wherewith we baptize. . . . And out of what Scripture have we learned the same? Have we not it of a secret and unwritten ordinance?"

Socrates, in his *Church History*, says this holy water was to be found in many churches at the beginning of the fourth century, but the first certain instance we have in 540 at St. Sophia, at Constantinople, under Justinian I.

The pagan Romans sprinkled their horses with holy water to guard them from evil spirits and accidents in the races in the Circensian games. The Catholic Romans did the same. They say, "Once on a time the horses of some Christians outran those of the heathen, because they were sprinkled with holy water." This superstition was brought in by St. Anthony, the patron saint of animals. On his day, January 17, the priests sprinkle all animals with a brush "in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."

This Anthony preached to the fish, who listened very devoutly, as may be seen in a painting in the Pope's Vatican palace.

RELICS.

In the temple of the Olympian Zeus they kept, in a bronze casket, the shoulder bone of Pelops found in the sea, indicated by an oracle, to save the Eleans from a pestilence, also the miracle-working great toe of Pyrrhos. At Messina they have the relics of Idas; at Sparta, those of Orestes; at Tegea, the hair of Medusa. The Thebans kept the bones of Hector to insure prosperity. Plutarch tells us Cimon found the bones of Theseus, and Athens built a beautiful temple and set apart a holiday for them.

In India the goddess Parvati committed suicide, and her husband carried her body around. To lighten the burden of the poor fellow the god Vishnu kindly cut the body into fifty pieces, and wherever a part fell, a temple grew to honor it. The temples are hundreds of miles apart, and the relic of the goddess makes the temple holy.

Buddha's teeth, nails, bones, and hair are sacredly preserved and on festival days exhibited. Of course, many miracles have been wrought by these holy relics.

Such was the demand for relics of their gods, that many cities of Egypt had arms and legs of the same god.

Though the Bible forbids all superstition, this piece of heathenism was introduced by the Romanists. The traffic in relics became so shameless that the Emperor Theodosius, in 386, by an edict threatened severe punishments to all priests selling relics of saints. In 397, forty-eight bishops, in a Council at Carthage, organized the cult of the saints.

In 675, a council condemned the custom of bishops marching in procession before relics as if they were the ark of the Lord. In 787, churches could not be consecrated unless relics could be obtained. The Council of Trent rather encouraged the veneration of relics; the creed of Pius IV declares, "That the relics of saints are to be venerated."

At Braley Priory there was a red girdle of Mary and a white girdle of the Magdalen, which were rented out to women; Mary's was the more expensive one. A piece of Thomas's

shirt hastened birth; a bottle of Mary's milk helped nursing mothers.

The Pope gave to the Emperor of Austria as a special favor what was declared to be a tooth of St. Peter—in the 19th century.

Dr. Manning writes Cardinal Wiseman: "The Archbishop of Milan received me very kindly and has given me two relics of the blood of St. Charles. There was no portion of the body to be obtained." (Of St. Charles Borromeo, a branch of whose order was to be established in England.)

The Romanists show the handkerchief with which Veronica wiped Christ's face; the reed and the sponge of vinegar offered to Him on the cross; the nails which pierced His hands and feet; the spear which was thrust into His side; the column to which He was tied during the scourging; the thorns of His crown; His blood and hair; His manger; the napkin about His head in the tomb. No less than twenty cathedrals show His seamless robe. Enough pieces of the cross are shown to make many crosses. They explain that God multiplied this as He multiplied the loaves and fishes.

The Romanists show the Virgin's hair, milk, girdle, veil, shreds of her garments, and her house, brought by angels from Syria to Loreto, in Italy.

They show the heads of Peter and Paul and portions of their body.

Jerome tells us Arcadius brought the bones of Samuel from Judea to Thrace.

Charles the Great helped find the blood, hair, and garments of John Baptist, the bones of Zacharias, some memorials of Simeon. Some of Noah's beard was on view in the 14th century.

Louis IX bought for a fabulous sum a twisted wreath of brambles said to be the "true crown of thorns." There are about 150 "true nails" wherewith Christ was nailed to the cross; enough wood of the "true cross" to lade a goodly ship. There are twelve heads of John Baptist.

They show the footprints of the Savior, just as the old heathen showed the footprints of the feet of Hercules and Theseus.

To St. Veronica's handkerchief Pope John XXII composed this prayer: "Hail, holy Face of our Redeemer, printed upon a cloth as white as snow; purge us from all spots of vice, and join us to the company of the Blessed! Bring us to our country, O Happy Figure, there to see the pure Face of Christ!"

Pope Urban VIII built an altar to Veronica in St. Peter's Cathedral. According to Pope Innocent III this handkerchief grants ten days' indulgence to all visitors. When in Rome, Luther saw this relic.

St. Aureliana, "the virgin martyr of the proud and royal Aurelian family," was taken from the catacombs after sixteen centuries and taken to the convent of the St. Franciscan Sisters at Cincinnati, and the Archbishop asks all devout Catholics to pray for her help, according to the *Freeman's Journal* of September 24, 1870.

"Archbishop Sebastian G. Messmer presented last night to St. Gall's Church, 1018 Third Street, a relic of the saint for whom the church is named, having brought the relic back with him from his recent visit to his native land, Switzerland. In his presentation address the archbishop expressed the pleasure it gave him to bring to a church of his diocese, named for the saint who came as an apostle from Ireland to bring Christianity to Switzerland, a relic of that saint. Eighteen priests were in the procession, the entire congregation, and 100 children, the services closing with the benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. The relic, which is a bone of the saint, will be exposed during public services in the church on the altar dedicated to St. Gall."

A Modernist's Letters to His Holiness Pope Pius X says: "The evidences of superstition, of a religion of amulets, charms, and relics, may be seen wherever Roman Catholicism has set foot." (p. 97.)

"If the pagan Greeks venerated the hair of Medusa, the

lyre of Orpheus, and the vessels of Agamemnon, a Christian people are quite on a line with them in prostrating before a mythical wristbone of St. Ann or the rod of Moses, still kept in St. John Lateran, or the breath of Christ at Genoa, or the window through which the Angel Gabriel entered the house of Mary, or the disgusting relic of St. Bartholomew, once revered at Treves. Neither could it ever serve any conceivable benefit to religion that high honors have been paid to twenty different bodies of John the Baptist, eighteen of St. Paul, six heads of Ignatius Martyr, sixty fingers of St. Jerome, forty holy shrouds, and seven hundred thorns from the sacred crown. Nor can intelligent people be profitably present at a mass or office of St. Josaphat when they know that he is none other than Buddha; or at a panegyric of St. Veronica, when they are aware that originally she was the gnostic principle of generation. It is difficult, too, to arouse devotion to St. Apollinaris, a lineal descendant of Apollo, or to Cosmas and Damian, who have succeeded to the place of Castor and Pollux." (pp. 99. 100.)

Milwaukee, Wis.

W. DALLMANN.

THE PROOF TEXTS OF THE CATECHISM WITH A PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.

THE SECOND ARTICLE.

THE WORK OF REDEMPTION.

(Continued.)

Rev. 5, 9: *Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood.*

Thou, Christ, wast slain as the only offering well pleasing to God. Thus we were *redeemed*, bought back from the slavery of sin and iniquity, from the servitude of Satan, and became Christ's own, Eph. 5, 2; Hebr. 9, 14. *Thou hast given Thy blood* as the redemption-money, as a ransom, to the Judge, and it had the power to quench God's wrath. For *Thy blood* is God's blood, Acts 20, 28. — Indeed, we are bought with a price,

1 Cor. 6, 19. Now by right of purchase we Christians are Christ's own, and He is our Lord.

Is. 53, 11: *He shall see of the travail of His soul, and shall be satisfied: by His knowledge shall my righteous Servant justify many; for He shall bear their iniquities.*

This passage speaks of the redemptive work of Christ. "*He shall see of the travail of His soul.*" Christ suffered not only in His body, but also in His soul. His *soul*, too, was *in travail*. The work is accomplished. Now He shall see the fruits of this travail. As v. 10 expresses it: "He shall see His seed" — the *ecclesia* — "and shall be satisfied." (Acts 20, 28.) He has bought the Church of God with His own blood. The Gospel is preached. Sinners, who have caused the travail of His soul, are won thereby. They acclaim Him their King. This the exalted Christ views with satisfaction. He took away the sin of the world, John 1, 29; He is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, 1 John 2, 2. He bought even them that deny Him, 2 Pet. 2, 1. He would have all men to be saved, but, alas! of many He must weepingly complain: "Ye would not." But still there are some who receive Him, believe in Him. These constitute the Church. As these believers are added to the Church, either one by one, or in great numbers, Christ sees of the travail of His soul, and views it with great satisfaction. His work bears results. "*He shall see and be satisfied with the travail of His soul.*" "*By His knowledge shall my righteous Servant justify many.*" Christ, the righteous Servant, shall *justify* many, shall make many righteous. He is not only righteous in Himself, but also the one who makes others — sinners — righteous, righteous before God. The means with which He accomplishes this is expressed in the phrase: "*by His knowledge,*" or as it may also be translated: "*by the knowledge of Himself.*" Both renditions say the same thing essentially. "By the knowledge of Himself" says that the many shall know Him = believe in Him. The former, "*by His knowledge,*" says: Christ possesses this knowledge. This knowledge He imparts to others. The contents of this knowledge are

essentially Christ's sufferings and death, their purpose and effect, in short, the Gospel of our salvation. Through it Christ imparts knowledge, knowledge of Himself as the Savior, implants faith in the heart. Thus the righteousness merited by Him is applied to the many—they are justified, made righteous before God. Thus the many are robed in Christ's righteousness. This Christ sees, and is satisfied with the travail of His soul.

An outflow of this righteousness of faith is the righteousness of life. Before God the believers are holy, but their life is still imperfect. Iniquities—sins—are still to be found on account of the weakness of the flesh. We need consolation therefor. It is this: "*For (and) He shall bear their iniquities.*" By one offering Christ has perfected forever them that are sanctified. But this offering, this propitiation, has continuous power. The exalted Christ is our Advocate with the Father; the righteousness which He, the sin-bearer, merited for us, 1 John 2, 1, 2, He makes His plea. Thus our sins of weakness cannot subvert our state of righteousness before God.

NOTE.—For passages sub § 158 see THEOL. QUART., current volume, p. 128.

STATE OF EXALTATION.

Phil. 2, 9—11: *Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.*

Treating of Christ's state of humiliation (THEOL. QUART., p. 120), we have seen that divine majesty was communicated to His human nature in virtue of the personal union, but that, though He possessed it, He did not make use of it constantly and fully.

The present passage speaks of Christ's exaltation. Wherein does it consist? The text says: "*Wherefore God hath also highly exalted Him.*" In the previous paragraph we were told what Christ had done; in this we are informed what God did.

God exalted Christ. *Wherefore?* Because this mind was in Christ, v. 5, because He humiliated Himself so deeply. This was so well pleasing to God that He exalted Christ. According to Scripture, God exalted Christ, and Christ exalted Himself, Hebr. 1, 3. The one dictum does not exclude the other. Here it is predicated of God. God did this — exalted Christ. That does not argue for subordination, does not say that Christ is inferior to God the Father. Whom did God exalt? The *man* Christ. Christ is true God. According to His divine nature He could not be exalted. He is “over all God.” But according to His human nature He could be and was exalted. In the state of humiliation the Savior took upon Himself the form of a servant, v. 7. In the state of exaltation this form of a servant was discarded. In the former state He did not fully and constantly use the divine majesty imparted to His human nature; now He does. Observe the adverb “highly.” He is *highly exalted*, *ὑπερύψωσεν*, that says, He is exalted above *all things*. He is Lord of all, and mightily rules and reigns over all things also according to His human nature — rules, as the context manifests, mightily in the kingdom of glory, in the kingdom of grace, in the kingdom of power. He has “*a name above all names*” — none is higher, greater than His. Christ is God like unto the Father. The man Christ is the most high God. “Exaltation” signifies a change of Christ’s state, not a change of His essence. The incarnate *λόγος* was always the same, only His mode of existence was different; hence we speak of His two states, the state of humiliation and the state of exaltation.

God gave “*Him a name which is above every name,*” *sc.*, the name Jesus. And what was the purpose of His exaltation? “*That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow,*” etc. That clearly says, as Paul expresses it: “He is far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come,” Eph. 1, 20—22. *At the name of Jesus every knee should bow* — so highly God exalted Him. Divine honor is to

be accorded to this name. At the name of Jesus *every knee should bow*, that is, acknowledge Him as Lord. Jesus, the man Jesus, is thus to be honored. Three classes of creatures are mentioned that should thus accord divine honor to His name: "*things in heaven*" — angels and saints; "*things in earth*" — all mankind; "*things under the earth*" — Satan and his hellish cohorts. For a time He had become lower than the angels, Hebr. 2, 7. Voluntarily He had taken upon Himself the form of a servant — to serve, to save man. Voluntarily He had subjected Himself to the power of the Evil One. But after that cry on the cross, "It is finished!" all pain, poverty, subjection had come to an end. Now, in the state of exaltation, all creatures, whatsoever name they may have, wherever they may be, how great soever their power may be, are subjected to Him, bow and must bow their knees to Him, acknowledge Him as Lord of all. The angels in heaven do it willingly, likewise the believers on earth, and the unbelievers must do so, though unwillingly. Secretly, in their heart of hearts, they are forced to confess that He is Lord. Even the very devils in hell must acknowledge Christ's lordship, even they, albeit with gnashing of teeth, must concede that they cannot hinder His will.

Highly God exalted Christ. How highly? He has a name above every name; every knee must bow before Him; every tongue must confess Him Lord. Verily, this man Jesus is "God over all!" "Thou madest Him a little lower than the angels; Thou crownedst Him with glory and honor, and didst set Him over the works of Thy hands: Thou hast put all things in subjection under His feet. For in that He put all in subjection under Him, He left nothing that is not put under Him," Hebr. 2, 7, 8.

And this was done, says our text, "*to the glory of God the Father.*" God's decree from eternity was to save man through His Son. This decree has been carried out. "All glory be to God on high." All enemies are subdued. God's power, holiness, righteousness, wisdom, love, mercy, His truth and faithfulness, have become manifest in Christ's redemptive work.

Descent into Hell.

1 Pet. 3, 18. 19: *Christ was put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison.*

1. Who descended into hell? "*For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, . . . being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit . . . went.*" Christ went. This person, who is at once true man and true God, went; the whole person, with body and soul, went. It is the same person that afterwards, as the subsequent context shows, ascended into heaven. So it is wrong to say, as some do, that this descent took place while Christ's body lay in the grave, and that He performed this work according to His soul only. Let us observe the text closely: "*For Christ*" — that is, the God-man, the whole person, "*being put to death in the flesh*" — Christ died according to His human nature, "*but*" — He did not remain in death — "*but quickened by the Spirit,*" *i. e.*, made alive by virtue of His divine nature, as He said, speaking of His death: "*Break this temple,*" meaning His body, "*and in three days I will raise it up.*" So Christ, who suffered and died for us, was quickened, vivified, made alive; body and soul were reunited. This same Christ, now in a glorified state, went.

2. According to what nature did He go? According to His human nature, for as God He is omnipresent and cannot be said to go anywhere. On account of the personal union of the natures in Christ, this going to a certain place, which is a property of the one nature only, is predicated of the whole person. So Christ, the God-man, went to this place designated "*prison.*"

3. Now what are we to understand by this term? Light is shed upon the nature of this place by the text itself. It reads: Christ "*went and preached to the spirits in prison.*" What spirits? To the spirits "*which sometime were disobedient.*" Disobedient to what? To the Word of God. The Gospel had been preached to them, but they turned a deaf ear to it, just as so many do to-day. "*In the days of Noah*" people

were "*disobedient*," they *believed not*. These people perished in the Flood. And these disobedient people, dying in unbelief, are now in *prison*. Whither do unbelieving people go? To hell. This prison is hell. "He that believeth not shall be damned." "Prison" is the abode of the damned—hell. According to all the teachings of Scriptures there are but two places hereafter, heaven and hell. To designate this latter place—hell—the New Testament employs three words: Hell, Hades, Prison. All three denote the same place—hell. This place is called "hell" on account of the *fiery* tortures there to be endured. The same place is called "Hades"—"the realm of the dead"—in reference to the *eternal* death. Once in Hades, death is everlasting. Hades is hell, aye, "Hades" is a direct synonym for "hell" in the New Testament, all the vain mouthings of the modern theologians to the contrary notwithstanding. It does not take great acumen of mind to see this. Luke 16, 23. 24 speaks of the rich man in hell. Our King James's Version correctly and plainly renders the text thus: "And in *hell* he (the rich man) lift up his eyes." The Revised Version says: "And in *Hades* he lift up his eyes." Hades, the modern theologians would have us believe, is a sort of quiet anteroom to heaven, a waiting-room, and, withal, a pretty comfortable place. All this is mere twaddle. Judge for yourselves! Take the text of the Revised Version: "And in *Hades* he lift up his eyes, *being in torments*." So Hades is a place of torments, of excruciating pain. Hades is hell. We read on: "And seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom." Abraham and Lazarus were in heaven; the rich man *afar off* in that other place—hell. "And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me!" The rich man, being in Hades, was in a place where no mercy is shown. Hades is hell. Proceed with the text: "And send Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue." Hades is a place of such a nature that, being granted one drop of water to alleviate the terrible torments there endured for the hundredth part of a second, this is looked upon as great mercy. Hades is hell. The

rich man continues: "For I am tormented in this flame." Hades is a place where the inmates are tormented in the *flame* — in fire. Hades is hell. — The translation of the King James's Version is true; so is Luther's: "Als er in der *Hoelle* und in der Qual war."

The third word the New Testament employs to describe "hell" is the one in our text — *prison*. Prison this place of torment is called to indicate its *purpose*. Hell is a prison from which there is no escape. Matt. 5, 26 our Lord Himself speaks of this prison, saying of such as enter it: "Verily, I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing." When will that be? Never. — Thus "hell," "Hades," "prison," all denote one and the same place, "that place which is prepared for the devil and his angels," that place of which, in reference to the unbelievers, it is said: "Their worm shall not die, neither their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring to all flesh." To this place Christ went.

4. When did He go? That question is easily answered by consulting the text. V. 18 speaks of Christ's suffering, death, and quickening; v. 19, of *His descent into hell*; v. 21, of His resurrection; v. 22, of His ascent into heaven and His sitting at the right hand of God; chap. 4, 5, of His return to judgment. Thus the time is clearly marked. It was after His quickening and before His resurrection. In that interval, perhaps in a moment of time, the now glorified Christ appeared in the nether world.

5. What was His purpose in going there? The text answers: "*to preach*." Despite this plain, unmistakable assertion, there are such as teach that Christ descended to hell to suffer the torments of hell for us. This is absolutely false. It does not only do violence to this text, but it is contrary to the words of our Savior uttered on the cross: "It is finished." — Nor was His purpose in going there to release the Old Testament saints from prison (*limbus patrum*), as the papists aver. He went there *to preach*.

6. What did He preach? There are such as say that He preached the Gospel in order to give those who had no opportunity to hear the Gospel in this life another chance to hear of, and accept, the merits of Christ and thus be saved. This is absolutely false again, for the text plainly says Christ preached to such as were "sometime disobedient," who would not believe. This thought, that the Gospel was preached in hell, is furthermore expanded, and the possibility of conversion after death for all is taught by most modern theologians. This dogma, which is but the doctrine of purgatory of the Catholics, furbished and polished up somewhat, has no foundation in Scripture, as even some noted leaders who promulgate it honestly concede; but the thought is fascinating to them, and thus they teach "commandments," or rather figments, "of men as doctrines of God." It is a soul-destroying doctrine, which fosters carnal security. It is a religion of the flesh. People are led to think: "Well and good, it matters not how I live or die here on earth, after death I'll have another chance, and I'll be sure to embrace it." Oh, how much these seducers of souls will have to answer for on that Great Day, for it is written: "It is appointed unto men once to die, but thereafter"—what? a millennium? a state of second probation? a possibility of conversion? No, a thousand times no!—"but thereafter the judgment." There is no conversion after death. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." And what does the text of the rich man and Lazarus teach? "The rich man died and was buried." And the very next thing? "And in hell he lift up his eyes," etc., Luke 16, 19. No conversion after death! "He that believeth not is condemned already because he hath not believed in the name of the only-begotten Son of God," John 3, 18 ff.—All Scripture is against this false tenet, and they that hold it get no consolation from our text. For nowhere does it say here that Christ preached the Gospel. It simply says: Christ *preached*. The word in the original is a word of neutral meaning, which, translated, means *to preach, to proclaim, to publish*

as a herald. This is conceded by all conversant with the matter. How, then, do we know what Christ did preach? The context must give us a key to that. And the context is plain, forceful, cogent, so that any one open to conviction, any one who investigates it with an unbiased mind, without preconceived opinions, cannot be left in doubt as to its meaning. Christ preached the Law, the damning Law; He told them in effect: "You are justly damned." Let us see that! "*Christ preached to the spirits in prison which sometime were disobedient when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a-preparing.*" What does the text say? 1. These people were *disobedient*. The Gospel had been preached to them during their lifetime. They despised it. "He that believeth not shall be damned." This Christ preached to them. "You have despised me, spurned my Gospel message; your lot is just." 2. God was *long-suffering once*. But now His long-suffering had come to an end; *once*—during their lifetime; now—no more. 3. God *waited*. He had waited 120 years! God had given them a long time to repent; He had done all to save them. 4. God had sent them the preacher of righteousness, Noah, to warn them of the impending doom if they should not repent. 5. The building of the ark itself was an object sermon. They despised Noah, and ridiculed the building of the ark. Thus we see the *guilt, the damning guilt*, of these people is stressed. And the correlative of guilt is punishment. 6. If the modern theologians were in the right, who maintain that the Gospel was here preached by Christ, we should at least expect to hear of a mitigating circumstance, an excuse for the disobedience of the spirits in prison. But no, nothing of the kind. *Their guilt is emphasized, and guilt demands punishment.* Whosoever despises the grace of God must be punished. The doctrine taught here is: *Unbelief is a cause of damnation.* So, then, it was not the Gospel that Christ preached, but the Law, the judgment.

The exact words of this sermon are not given, but the import of it was: "You have despised me, whom you now see to

be the victor over death, and hell, and sin; you are justly damned." Thus "Christ, having been quickened in His grave, exhibited Himself to hell as its conqueror, and triumphed over all His infernal enemies." He has, as we read in Col. 2, 15, "spoiled principalities and powers, He made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it."

Springfield, Ill.

LOUIS WESSEL.

(To be continued.)

LUTHER'S VIEWS ON LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE.

We say and pray in our general church prayer that the Lord of lords would graciously preserve our country unimpaired in its liberty. The most precious of the liberties of our country is religious liberty, or freedom of conscience. The first seeds of this liberty were brought to this country by spiritual descendants of Doctor Martin Luther. In the twenty-eight resolutions drawn up at Stockholm, August 15, 1642, by Oxenstierna, the chancellor under Gustavus Adolphus, and others for the proper regulation of the Swedish colony established in 1638 on the banks of the Delaware, the colonists were charged not to disturb the Holland colonists who might settle among them "in the indulgence granted them as to the exercise of the Reformed religion." Such an instruction would not have been possible if Luther had not lived in the sixteenth century. Says Peter Bayne, LL. D.:¹⁾ "Anglo-Saxondom thanks Luther, next, for freedom of conscience. For more than a thousand years it had been the law of Europe that the heretic should be put to death; and the death assigned to heresy was fire. Hating and fearing heresy with an intensity of emotion which in our age the most imaginative can but feebly realize, Luther . . . declared that this method of dealing with the heretic was wrong from top to bottom. Were it otherwise, he said, the hangman would be the best theologian." The Reformed theologian Schaff

1) Martin Luther. His Life and Work, vol. I, p. 8. Cassell and Company, 1881.

declares: "Luther's bold stand at the Diet of Worms, in the face of the Pope and the Emperor, is one of the sublimest events in the history of liberty. If liberty, both civil and religious, has since made progress, it is due in large measure to the inspiration of that heroic act."²⁾ "On this, as on so many other subjects, Luther was in advance of all his contemporaries, and, as Schaff further admits, 'has left some of the noblest utterances against coercion in matters of conscience, which contain almost every essential feature of the modern theory on the subject.'"³⁾

The THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY presents some of these utterances in an English translation. They are arranged in chronological order. The translation has been made from the St. Louis edition of Luther's complete works.

Luther's written reply to Cajetan at Augsburg, October 14, 1518: "Only that I be not compelled to do anything against the conviction of my conscience." (Vol. XV, 584, 57.)

Letter to Cajetan, Sunday, October 17, 1518: "I should most willingly . . . recant everything if in any way my conscience would permit it. For I know that I ought to yield to no man's command, advice, or favor to such an extent as to say or do anything against my conscience." (XV, 591, 7.)

"To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation," published about the middle of August, 1520: "Therefore it is a mischievous invention, and they are not able to produce a single letter to prove that it rests with the pope alone to interpret the Scriptures or to approve their interpretation; they have assumed the right to themselves. . . . Besides that, we are all priests, as I have said, and have all one faith, one Gospel, one sacrament; how, then, should we not also have the power of tasting and judging what is right or wrong in matters of faith? What becomes of St. Paul's words, 1 Cor. 2, 15: 'He that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man;' and also 2 Cor. 4, 13: 'We having the same spirit of

2) The Lutheran Cyclopedia, p. 407 f.

3) Ibid.

faith? Why, then, should we not perceive, as well as an unbelieving pope, what agrees or disagrees with faith? . . . We should overcome heretics with books, not with fire, as the old Fathers did. If learning consisted in overcoming heretics with fire, the executioners would be the most learned Doctors on earth." (X, 278, 22. 23. 130.)

Letter to Spalatin at Worms, January 16, 1521: "You see what Hutten seeks." (Hutten had requested that Spalatin sound the Elector whether he would permit him and Sickingen, in case of need, to seek shelter in his domains, and thus aid and abet them in their plans to overthrow the papacy with fire and sword.) "I would not have any one contend for the Gospel with violence and bloodshed: thus I have written to the man. By the Word the world has been overcome; by the Word the Church has been preserved; by the Word also it will be restored: and Antichrist also, as he rose without hand, so will he be destroyed without hand by the Word." (XV, 2506, 2.)

Luther's reply at Worms, Thursday, April 18, 1521: "Unless I be convicted by testimonies of the Scriptures, or by evident reason,—for I believe neither the pope nor the councils alone, since it is evident that they have often erred and contradicted one another,—I am vanquished by the Scriptures adduced by me, and my conscience is bound in the words of God; I neither can nor will recant anything, since it is neither safe nor honest to do anything against conscience. Here I stand; I cannot do otherwise; God help me! Amen."

To the Archbishop and Elector of Treves Luther said at Worms, April 25, 1521: "The pope is not judge in matters pertaining to God's Word and faith; but every Christian man must see and judge for himself, even as he must live and die according to it; for faith and God's Word are the property of every one in the whole congregation. This I proved by St. Paul: 'If anything be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace,' 1 Cor. 14, 30. From this passage it plainly appears that the master ought to follow the scholar

if the latter has a better opinion supported by the words of God." (XV, 1915, 8.)

Letter to Melanchthon, about the middle of May, 1521 (XV, 1907): "I hear that at Erfurt they are resorting to violence against the dwellings of priests; I am surprised that the city council permits it and connives at it, and that our friend Lang does not speak against it."

Of Confession, June 1, 1521 (XIX, 832, 33. 71. 75—77. 86): "The civil government does not undertake to govern men's consciences; it deals only with temporal goods. . . . For in the conscience God wants to be alone and to have His Word rule alone; here there must be freedom from all commandments of men. . . . As our first proof we adduce the saying found in the legend of St. John the Evangelist: *Non placent Deo coacta servitia*, Forced or unwilling service is not pleasing to God. And even if this legend did not say so, Scripture teaches it throughout. — Though He demands the observance of His laws and requires it of every one, still He takes no pleasure in those who observe them reluctantly, by constraint, from fear of punishment, and not freely and willingly. . . . But if He does not wish to have His Law kept with reluctance and by constraint, how much less will it please Him if men are compelled to accept His counsel and promises which are not divine demands! — It is far more tolerable that people be compelled to observe His laws than that they be compelled to accept His counsels and promises. Take an example: Suppose some rich person should obligate himself by a promise that on a certain day he would give to all needy persons a good garment which would be useful to none but the individual recipient himself; but seeing that they refused to accept it, you fool, prompted by your kind intentions, thought you would help matters by urging and constraining them to receive it, knowing full well that they would not keep it, but throw it into a corner; what sort of service do you miserable wiseacre suppose you were doing the rich man whom you wished to help dispose of his substance in such a foolish manner? He would

suppose you to be insane or his greatest enemy; for the saying is true, You cannot give to any one without his will and consent, but you can take away from him without his thanks. Behold, this is precisely what you senseless, raging pope and your sect are doing, you worst enemies of God! . . . Likewise I would preach faith and baptism; I would, however, compel none to receive it, but would accept all that would come of their own accord. In the same manner I would preach the grace of the Sacrament of the Altar, but leave it free, compelling none to partake of it."

During Luther's stay at the Wartburg, the Zwickau prophets came to Wittenberg, and, together with Carlstadt, held their iconoclastic orgies. In a letter to Spalatin, dated January 17, 1522 (XV, 2606), Luther says in reference to these "heavenly prophets": "Still I should not like to have them put in prison, particularly by those who espouse our cause. . . . See also that our prince does not stain his hands with the blood of these new prophets."

On his return to Wittenberg he preached a course of eight sermons on the crisis, March 9—13, 1522. (XX, 17, 3—6; 8—10.) "The mass is an evil thing, and God hates it, in that it is celebrated as if it were a sacrifice and meritorious work; therefore it ought to be abolished. Nevertheless, love should not proceed harshly in this matter, removing the mass by force. It should be preached, it should be written and declared that the mass, celebrated in such manner, is a sinful thing; however, no one should be taken by the hair and pulled away from it; but the matter should rather be left to God, and we should let His Word work alone, without our concurrent effort or labor. Why? Because I do not hold in my hand the hearts of men, as the potter holds the clay, to do with them as I please; even as God holds all men's hearts in His hand to convert or to harden them, Jer. 18, 6; Rom. 9, 21. I can come no further with the Word than into the ears; into the heart I cannot come. Since faith cannot be poured into the heart, no one can nor should be forced or compelled to it; for God does

that alone, quickening the Word in men's hearts when and where He wills, according to His divine knowledge and good pleasure. Hence we should give free course to the Word, and not add our efforts to it. We have *jus verbi*, and not *executionem*, that is, we shall preach the Word, but leave the result to God alone.

"But if I act hastily, purposing to abolish this abuse of the mass by violence, there will be many who must join in the movement without knowing whether it be right or wrong, saying, I do not know what to think of it; I had to follow the congregation, the multitude, and force; thereby they get an erring, uneasy conscience of which they can afterwards hardly get rid again. And the compulsory law produces merely a sham, an outward show, apéry, and a human ordinance, which begets seeming saints, hypocrites, and dissemblers. For sincerity of heart, and faith, and love are wanting. Where these three elements are lacking in a deed, it may be ever so righteous and good, it will amount to nothing; I would not give the stem of a pear for it.

"We must first win the people's heart; and this is done when I use the Word of God, preaching the Gospel, telling the people their error, and saying, Dear sirs, dear priests, dear papists, abandon the mass; your way of celebrating it is not right, you are sinning thereby and provoking God's wrath; I have now told you. I would, however, make no laws for them, nor insist on a common order. Whoever would be willing to follow, would follow; whoever would be unwilling, would stay away.

"If this were done, the Word would to-day fall into this man's heart, to-morrow into another's, and cause him to surrender now and judge himself guilty of having erred in this matter, and he would go his way and abandon the mass of his own accord. Thus God would effect more by His Word than if you, and I, and the whole world were to combine all power. For by the Word God conquers the heart; when the heart is conquered, you have won the whole man. Then the thing must finally fall and cease of itself. . . . I do not say this because

I wish to establish the mass again; no, let it lie in God's name; since it is fallen, let it be fallen. However, this we must bear in mind, and constantly preach it, that faith must not be seized and bound, nor by any kind of order joined to any work. Follow this rule and none other! By such storming and violence you will not effect your object; mark my words! . . .

"In brief, I will preach it, I will declare it, I will write it, but none will I force and constrain by violence; for faith must be voluntary and unconstrained, and must be embraced without compulsion."

Letter to Nic. Hausmann, March 17, 1522 (XV, 2011): "See that you do not permit any innovations to be introduced by a common order or by violence; by the Word alone those things must be attacked, overthrown, and abolished which our people have undertaken to abolish by force and violence. Thus Satan has driven them. . . . I denounce and reject by the Word alone. Whoever believes may believe and follow; whoever does not believe may disbelieve and go his way. For to faith, and whatever pertains to faith, no one must be compelled, but rather drawn by the Word, so that the willing believer comes of his free will."

Letter to Nic. Hausmann, March 26, 1522 (XXIa, 385 f.): "We deal with these matters by means of the Word alone, teaching what the Gospel contains concerning the mass and communion, and forcing none to abstain from it, or to take part in its celebration. Let every man's conscience see to it that he respond to the Gospel, till all grow and all become Evangelical."

To the city council of Altenburg, April 28, 1522 (XXIa, 397): "If they should say that it is not for us to judge which is the Gospel, or that it has not as yet been decided by a council: this we do not concede to them; for Scripture does not authorize a council, but each and every Christian to judge of doctrines, 1 Cor. 14, 29, and to know and avoid the wolves, Matt. 7, 15, and does not refer to what others decide, even though they were angels, but to every one's conscience; for every one must

believe for himself and know the difference between true and false doctrine; for he that believeth shall be saved.'"

Sermon on the 8th Sunday after Trinity, Matt. 7, 15—22 (XI, 1394, 3. 4 ff.): "Christ, our Lord, here commands and authorizes all Christians to be judges of all doctrine, granting them the right to decide what is right or wrong. Among the false Christians this point of doctrine has been changed and perverted for us for nigh unto a thousand years so that we had no right to judge, but simply had to accept without any examination what the pope and the councils decided.

"Now the Gospel under consideration completely overthrows popery and all councils; for we are not obliged to observe what the pope commands and what men decree. Hence I say once more, Grasp well this Gospel; for neither the pope nor the councils, nor any one is given authority to decree and decide what is faith. For Christ says, 'Beware of false prophets!' Either the Gospel must be lying, or else the pope and his councils. Christ says: We have the right to judge all doctrines and whatever we are commanded to do or not to do. Here the Lord is not speaking to the pope, however, but to all Christians. And just as the precept, 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them,' is given to all, even so these words, 'Beware of false prophets!' exclude no one. Whence it clearly follows that I may indeed judge of doctrine.

"Hence I am to say, Pope, you and your councils have made decrees; now I have the power to judge whether or no I may accept them. Why? Because you will not stand and answer for me when I must die, but I must see for myself where I stand, that I may be certain.

"For you must be so certain that it is God's Word as certain you are that you are living, nay, even more certain; for on this alone your conscience must rest. Even if all men should come, yes, the angels too, and all the world decide something, if you cannot grasp nor form the judgment, you are lost; for you must not base your opinion on the pope nor on any one else; you must be able to say for yourself, This God

says, that He does not say; this is right, that is wrong; otherwise it is not possible for you to stand.

"For if in the hour of death you rely on the pope and the councils, saying, The pope has said this, the councils have decided that, the holy Fathers, Augustine, Ambrose, have so voted, then the devil can soon make a loophole and insinuate the question, What if this be false? What if they had erred? When you experience such a temptation, you have already been overcome. Therefore you must play it safely, so that you may boldly and confidently say, This is God's Word; on this I will risk my life and a thousand necks, if I had them. . . .

"They begin to say, however, But how can we know what is God's Word, and what is true or false? We must learn this of the pope and councils. Never mind! Let them decide and declare what they like; but I say, You cannot put your confidence in that nor satisfy your conscience, you must decide for yourself; your neck is at stake, your life is at stake. Therefore God must say to your heart, This is God's Word; otherwise there will be no decision."

To the church at Erfurt, July 10, 1522 (XIX, 962, 10): "Do as St. Paul says (Tit. 3, 10. 11): 'A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject, knowing that he that is such is subverted.' Teach with simplicity and give an account of your faith with gentleness. Whoever does not follow let him refuse to follow; whoever seduces may seduce; whoever creates a stench may create a stench still; whoever hallows may hallow still. You are excused; God will judge right; you can give to no man without his thanks. — I pray also, my dear brethren, that you would earnestly see to it that no disturbance be raised by our people, nor any occasion be given for it. There are many mischievous people who mean to aid the cause of the Gospel with swords and fists, and suppose they have done all when they abuse and harm priests and monks. They know not, however, that we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against spiritual wickedness in high places. Satan is a spirit, having neither flesh nor bones; wherefore he cannot be hurt with iron or fists. We must first wrest men's hearts

from him by the Word of Truth, that being our sword and fist which none are able to resist: with this weapon the friends of Christ cleave Behemoth in twain. See by what means I have discomfited popery and the papal hierarchy, which heretofore appeared so frightful to all the world, when people were singing, Who is able to make war with the beast? For it had power to make war even with the saints and to overcome them. (Rev. 13, 4. 7.) Yet I have never lifted a finger against it, but Christ slew it with the spirit of His mouth."

Letter to the church at Leisnig, January, 1523 (X, 954, 6): "No one is to be forced to believe and to receive the Gospel."

"That a Christian Assembly or Congregation has the Right and Authority to Judge all Doctrine," etc., 1523 (X, 1540, 3): "In this matter of judging doctrine, inducting and deposing teachers or pastors, we must pay no attention whatsoever to human tradition, law, ancient custom, usage, etc., whether it be established by pope or emperor, by princes or bishops, whether half the world or the whole world have so held, whether it have obtained one or a thousand years. For the soul of man is eternal, transcending all that is temporal; wherefore it must be ruled and held only with the eternal Word. For it is quite outrageous to rule men's consciences in matters divine with commandments of men and long-standing custom. . . .

"The word and doctrine of men have declared and ordained that the matter of judging doctrine should be left to the bishops, the learned, and the councils alone; that their decisions should be judged to be true and articles of faith, as their daily boasting about the papal canons sufficiently proves. For one can hear next to nothing out of their mouth besides this boast, that the right and authority to judge what is Christian or heretical belongs to them, and that the Christian layman ought to await their decision and abide by the same. This boast, by which they have terrorized the whole world, and which is their highest rock and confidence, behold, how insolently and foolishly it runs counter to the law and Word of God!

"For Christ declares quite the contrary, taking away from the bishops, the learned, and the councils both the right and the power of judging concerning doctrine, and giving it to every one and to all Christians alike, saying, John 10, 4. 5: 'My sheep know my voice.' 'My sheep know not the voice of strangers.'

"Here you see plainly, indeed, to whom the right of judging doctrine belongs. Bishop, pope, learned men, and any one has the right to teach; but the sheep are to judge whether they teach the voice of Christ or the voice of strangers. What are those bubbles able to say against this who clamor and cry, Councils, councils! Why, you must hear the learned, the bishops, the majority, you must have regard to ancient usage and custom! Do you suppose God's Word must give way to your ancient usage, custom, and bishops? Never! Therefore we let bishops and councils decide and declare what they like; but when we have the Word of God on our side, it must rest with us, and not with them, to say whether it is true or false, and they must yield to us and obey our Word.

"Here, methinks, you certainly see plainly enough what is to be expected of those who manage the soul with the word of men. Who fails to see now that all bishops, chapters, cloisters, and universities with all their members rave and rant against this clear word of Christ, in that they insolently take the right of judgment of doctrine from the sheep and arrogate it to themselves by their own wicked decree? Wherefore they are certainly to be held as murderers and thieves, wolves and apostate Christians, being openly convicted here not only of denying God's Word, but likewise of ordaining and acting contrary to it. . . .

"Again Christ says, Matt. 7, 15: 'Beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.' Observe that here Christ grants the right of judgment not to the prophets and teachers, but to the scholars and sheep. For how could one beware of false prophets if he were not to consider, examine, and judge their doctrine? Fur-

thermore, the false prophets are in no way among the hearers, but only among the teachers. Hence all teachers must necessarily be subject to the judgment of their hearers.

"Again, the third statement is that of St. Paul, 1 Thess. 5, 21: 'Prove all things; hold fast that which is good!' Note that here he will have no doctrine or decree held till it has been proved and recognized as good by the congregation that hears it. For this proving is not the business of the teachers; on the contrary, the teachers must first speak those things which are to be proved. Thus here also the judgment is taken from the teachers, and given to the scholars among the Christians."

"How Ministers are to be Chosen and Ordained," 1523 and 1524 (X, 1586, 65): "Christ teaches us that every one should consider his own welfare and salvation for himself, that he may know and be certain what to believe and whom to follow; that he is likewise a free, authorized judge of all that would teach him, being inwardly taught of God alone, John 6, 45. For you will not be damned or saved by another's doctrine, be it false or true, but by your belief alone. Another may teach and preach what he pleases, but it is for you to take heed at your greatest loss or gain what you believe."

When Luther's translation of the New Testament was eagerly bought and read everywhere as the most popular book of the day, Duke George of Albertine Saxony under severe penalties forbade his people to have it in their possession. This edict called forth Luther's excellent treatise on "Secular Magistrates: How Far They Must be Obeyed," 1523 (X, 395, 38 ff.): "The secular government has laws which extend no further than over body and property and whatever is external on earth. For over the soul God can and will allow no one to rule but Himself alone. Whenever the worldly power, therefore, presumes to legislate for the soul, it interferes with God's government, and only misleads and destroys the soul. This we purpose to make so plain that it cannot but be grasped, in order that our youngers, the princes and bishops, may see what fools

they are when they purpose to compel the people by their laws and commandments to believe thus or so.

"Although they are big fools, they must confess that they have no power over the soul. For it is evident that no man is able to kill or to quicken a soul, to lead it to heaven or to hell. And although they should refuse to believe this, Christ will certainly give sufficiently strong testimony to the truth of our statement, saying: 'Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell,' Matt. 10, 28. Here, methinks, the soul is plainly enough taken out of every human hand and placed under God's hand alone.

"Now tell me, how much wit do you suppose that chap to have who legislates where he has no authority whatsoever? Who would not judge him to be insane who would command the moon to shine when he wants it to shine? What a fine specimen of consistency if the citizens of Leipsic should want to impose laws on us at Wittenberg, or *vice versa*? They would certainly return thanks to such legislators by giving them snuff to clear the head and cure their cold. Notwithstanding, here our emperor and prudent princes are pursuing such a course of action, and permit pope, bishops, and sophists so to lead them, the blind leading the blind, that they command their people to believe, regardless of the Word of God, as they think fit; and yet claim to be Christian rulers; Heaven forbend!

"In addition, one may grasp it also by bearing in mind that every power should and can act only there where it is able to see, know, decide, judge, and bring about a change. For what sort of judge would he be who would blindly judge causes which he neither hears nor sees? Now tell me, how can any man see, know, try, judge, and change men's hearts? For this is exclusively a prerogative of God. . . . For this reason it is vain and impossible to command or to compel one by force to believe thus or so. . . .

"Besides, it is at every one's own peril how he believes, and he must see for himself that he believe aright. For as little as another can go to hell or to heaven for me, so little

also can he believe or disbelieve for me: and as little as he can open or shut heaven or hell for me, so little also can he force me to believe or not to believe. Since, then, it is at the peril of every one's conscience how he believes or disbelieves, and no prejudice is thereby done to the secular power, the latter should also be satisfied and mind its own business, letting people believe thus or so, as they can and like, and urging no one by force. For faith is essentially a free work, to which no one can be forced. Indeed, it is a divine work in the spirit; how, then, should external force be able to produce and extort it? Hence the common saying, which is found in Augustine also: To faith no one can and should be forced.

"Moreover, these blind, wretched people do not see what a vain and impossible task they are undertaking. For however severely they command, and however vehemently they rage, they can at all events make the people do no more than follow them with the mouth and with the hand; the heart they certainly cannot constrain, though they should tear themselves to pieces. For true is the proverb: Thoughts are free. . . .

"You say, But civil authority does not compel them to believe, but restrains only outwardly, lest the people be seduced by false doctrine; how else could heretics be restrained? I reply, This the bishops should do; to them this office and work has been committed, and not to the princes. For heresy can never be repressed by force; that calls for a different management, this being a conflict and controversy unlike that in which the sword is used. The Word of God must contend here; if that prove ineffectual, the thing will assuredly remain unaffected of temporal power, though it bathe the world in blood. Heresy is a spiritual thing which one cannot strike with steel, nor burn with fire, nor drown in water. Only the Word of God is here, however; that is sufficient, as St. Paul says, 2 Cor. 10, 4. 5: 'The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds; casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ.'

"Besides, there is no greater strengthening of faith and of heresy than when people proceed against it without the Word of God with mere force. For it will be held for certain that such power has no righteous cause, and deals contrary to justice, because it proceeds without the Word of God, and knows of no other resort than main force, as irrational brutes do. . . .

"Behold, then, what fine, prudent youngers these are! They mean to expel heresy, but go about it in such a way as only to strengthen the adversaries, laying themselves open to suspicion and justifying the former. If you wish to expel heresy, you must hit on a way by which, above all things, you pluck it out of the heart, and remove it root and all with right good will; by force you will not achieve this, but only strengthen it. What will it profit you, then, if you strengthen heresy in the heart, and weaken it only outwardly on the tongue, and make people tell lies? The Word of God, however, that enlightens the heart; and thus all heresies and errors pass out of the heart of themselves." (See also: "Of Adoring the Sacrament," 1524, XIX, 1321, 35.)

At the end of 1524, "Luther suddenly abandoned his views on the freedom of conscience," says A. F. Pollard, in "Cambridge Modern History," vol. II, p. 194. And an English Socialist writes: "Before the Peasants' War, when struggling to assert himself, Luther taught that heresy could not be repressed by force, that no fire could burn it, and no water drown it. Yet so soon as Luther saw other sectaries springing up around him, and claiming the same privilege as himself, he declared that as rebels to the State they deserved punishment, even banishment and death. This, then, is Luther's doctrine: The State is the head of religion, and *all* sectaries are rebels to the State." (Karl Pearson, M. A., formerly Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, in "The Ethic of Freethought," London, 1888, p. 232.) This writer evidently permitted himself to be blinded by his love for the Socialists of the sixteenth century, "the peasant robbers and murderers."

In a letter to Lazarus Spengler, of Nuernberg, dated February 4, 1525 (XXIa, 715), Luther says: "In reply to

your question as to how they [Thomas Muenzer and his followers in Nuernberg] should be punished, I, too, hold that they are not guilty of blasphemy, but I regard them just as the Turks and apostate Christians on whom secular magistrates are not to inflict punishment, particularly no corporal punishment. But if they should refuse to recognize and obey the secular magistrate, then everything is forfeited whatever they are and have; for in that case they assuredly meditate revolt and murder, and it is the duty of the secular magistrate to take cognizance of the matter." A few months later the Peasants' War came upon the country with all its horrors.

Sermon preached on the 5th Sunday after Epiphany on Matt. 13, 24—30; published in February, 1525, and republished in 1540 (XI, 504): "This Gospel teaches what attitude we are to maintain toward these heretics. We are not to root them out or destroy them. Christ plainly says here, 'Let both grow together.' We should use nothing but the Word of God here, because in regard to this matter it so happens that he who errs to-day, to-morrow may get into the right way. Who can tell at what time the Word of God will touch his heart? But if he be burned at the stake or deprived of his life in some other way, it is thereby made impossible for him to get into the right way. He is thus cut off from the Word of God and necessarily lost, whereas he might otherwise have been saved perhaps. In that case there comes to pass what the Lord says here in our text, *viz.*, while they gather up the tares, they root up also the wheat with them. That is, now, a most horrible thing in God's sight, and can never be justified. See, therefore, what insane people we have been so long a time, in that we meant to force the Turks to believe with the sword, the heretics with fire, the Jews by slaying, and gather up the tares by our own power, as if we were the people who are able to rule over men's hearts and minds, and as if we could make them godly and righteous, which only the Word of God can do. By killing them, however, we separate the people from the Word, so that it cannot possibly exert its influence on them, and thus make ourselves guilty of a double murder at once, so

far as we are concerned, inasmuch as we inflict temporal death on the body and, at the same time, eternal death on the soul, saying besides that we had done God service, and think we had earned a special reward in heaven. Therefore this passage should fairly frighten the inquisitors and manslayers (if they had no brow of brass), even if they had real heretics before them. But now they burn real saints, and are heretics themselves."

Letter to the city council of Danzig, May 5, 1525 (XXIa, 741): "But in particular, see that you are not taught to bear rule according to the law of Moses, and much less according to the Gospel. . . . The Gospel is a spiritual law, according to which rule cannot be borne, but every one must set it before himself to see whether or no he shall do what it says. And no one can and ought to be forced to accept it, even as no one can and ought to be forced to believe; for it is not the sword, but the Spirit of God that must teach and bear rule here. . . . The Gospel requires willing hearts that are led by the Spirit of God." See also the letter to the Christians in Livonia, June 17, 1525 (X, 259, 6).

"An Admonition to Peace," May, 1525 (XVI, 50, 9): "Secular magistrates must not interpose any prohibition as to what any one wishes to teach or believe, be it Gospel or falsehood; it is enough that they forbid the teaching of revolt and disturbances."

An open letter on the severe treatise against the peasants, 1525 (XIX, 40): "Who has ever heard that a person could be forced to do good or evil? Who is able to coerce a man's will?"

Letter to Spalatin, November 11, 1525 (XXIa, 807 f.): "Our princes do not compel to faith and the Gospel, but suppress external abominations. Since they [the papists] themselves, then, confess that princes have authority in external things, they condemn themselves. For princes must suppress public immoralities, as perjury, manifest blasphemies of God's name, such as these are, thereby compelling to no action, however, whether those who are being restrained believe or not, nor

yet when they revile in secret or not. For we are speaking of public revilings and blasphemies by which they blaspheme our God. This, I say, we must suppress if we can; if we cannot, we are compelled to permit it. Here no one is as yet compelled to faith or the Gospel; no one is compelled to an impious opinion of the heart, which they would do if they could."

At Augsburg, in 1518, the envoy of Cajetan, Urbanus de Serralonga, asked Luther, "What would you do if the pope and his cardinals were in your power?" "Treat them with respect," was Luther's reply. Carlstadt was one of the "other sectaries springing up around" Luther. Let us see whether Luther declared that he "deserved punishment, even banishment and death."

Letter to John Brismann in Königsberg, August 16, 1525 (XXIa, 772): "The unhappy fellow [Carlstadt] has been kept at my house in secret and safety [eight weeks]. Now the wide world is too narrow for him: he is everywhere so pursued that he has been compelled to beg his enemy for protection. I have treated the fellow as humanely as I possibly could, and have assisted him; however, he persists in his opinion, although convicted, as is the wont of this sort of spirits. Do you, therefore, beware of him and his doctrine!"

Letter to the Elector John, September 12, 1525 (XXIa, 779): "I write this, because I sincerely pity the poor man, and Your Electoral Grace well knows that mercy is to be shown to the miserable, especially to the innocent" [Carlstadt's family].

Letter to the Elector John, November 22, 1526 (XXIa, 895 f.): "Doctor Carlstadt has importuned me to intercede for him with Your Electoral Grace that he may be permitted to live at Kemberg, because the malice of the peasants makes it impossible for him to stay in the villages. I humbly beseech Your Electoral Grace to grant him this favor, although Your Electoral Grace has already done much for him and incurred much unfavorable comment on his account. He must answer for his soul; to his body and his own we should do good."

Letter to Nic. Gerbel, July 28, 1528 (XXIa, 1181): "Carlstadt, the viper in our bosom, is merely muttering, but does not dare to come out openly" [in favor of Zwingli].

Letter to the Elector John in regard to the abolition of the papal ceremonies in the collegiate church at Altenburg, February 9, 1526 (XXIa, 836): "Therefore you may graciously desire them either to desist altogether, or else to have their doings privately, without scandal to others. . . . If these abominations could or would be kept up without Your Electoral Grace's patronage and support [from the public treasury], you would be wholly without blame, and would have to let it continue. . . . The other reason is this: A secular ruler cannot permit his people to be led into dissension and discord by antagonistic preachers, because of the fear that it would eventually lead to disturbances and riot, but at one and the same place there shall also be the same kind of preaching. With this argument they at Nuernberg silenced their friars and closed the cloisters. . . . Lest they should say, however, that they were being compelled to faith, it should be intimated to them that such is not the intention, but that only their public scandal is forbidden, which they are not able to maintain by themselves, and concerning which they are obliged to confess that it has no warrant in Scripture, and yet mean to maintain the same wantonly to ruin other souls and to harm the country and its inhabitants, also to the disgrace and reproach of God and His Gospel. Let them be satisfied that they are allowed to stay in the country and to enjoy life and property, protection and honor, and that they may worship and serve in private whomsoever they like and as many gods as they like; publicly they shall not thus blaspheme the true God and seduce the people, unless they prove from Scripture that they have a right so to do."

Letter to the Christians at Erfurt, November, 1527 (X, 1524, 1): "God forbid that I should presume to have authority over other preachers, to be their judge or ruler, lest I also establish a papacy; but I will commit them to Christ, who only shall rule over His preachers in Christendom. . . . This,

I fear, is the reason why God is permitting you, despite this great light, to be troubled by that preacher of darkness, Doctor Conrad Klingens, the Franciscan, and does not give your city councilors courage to take action that the discord between the preachers be composed by causing them to hold a discussion and obliging those who cannot prove their views to keep silence, as other cities, Nuernberg and the like, have done. For it certainly is expedient for no city that public agitators and preachers be permitted to create discord among the people. One party should give way, whether it be the Evangelicals or the Papists, as Christ teaches, Matt. 10: 'In whatsoever city they refuse to hear your words, depart out of that city, and shake off the dust of your feet.' From him that refuses to hear us we are easily and soon parted."

"Against the Anabaptists," February, 1528 (XVII, 2188, 3): "Still it is not right, and I am sincerely sorry, that those wretched people [the Anabaptists] are so miserably murdered, burned, and cruelly slain. Everybody should be allowed to believe what he likes. If his belief be wrong, he will receive sufficient punishment in eternal hell-fire. Why, then, do they want to inflict on them temporal tortures also, so long as they merely err in faith, and are not seditious withal or otherwise resist the powers that be? Good God, how easily does it not happen that a person errs and falls into the snares of Satan! They should be resisted with Scripture and God's Word; with fire little will be achieved."

Letter to Wenceslaus Link, July 14, 1528 (X, 1533, 2 f.; cf. XXIa, 1403): "You ask whether it be lawful for the magistrate to kill false prophets? I am tardy to the sentence of death, even where it is abundantly merited. . . . For this reason I will and can in no wise advise nor admit that the magistrate have power to punish false teachers with death: it is enough that they be banished."

On April 19, 1529, the Protestants stated in their "Protest" that "in matters pertaining to God's honor and our souls' salvation every one must stand alone before God, and give an account of himself." "This "Protest," the "Magna Charta of

civil and religious liberty," had the full approval of Luther. (See De Wette, "Letters of Luther," III, 438—441.)

In the preface to his Small Catechism, 1529, Luther writes: "For although we cannot and should not force any one to believe, yet we should train and urge the masses to know what is right and wrong among those with whom they dwell and wish to make their living. For whoever would dwell in a city should know and observe the city laws which he wishes to enjoy, whether he believe or be at heart a hypocrite or knave."

Letter to Thomas Loescher, August 26, 1529 (XXIa, 1349; De Wette I, 326): "As to what you write about those blaspheming despisers [of the Gospel], this is my opinion: Even as no one is to be forced to believe and to accept the Gospel, so it is not to be permitted under the same magistrate that they blaspheme; but having been summoned, they are to be heard and to hear; and if they are not able to give an account, nor want to believe, they should also be bound over to complete silence; and a hotbed of sedition shall not be maintained. For whoever will contradict should do so publicly, and either publicly or privately he should be held in check by the authority of the magistrate." Compare also the letter under the same date to Joseph Levin Metzsch, X, 1686.

To the Elector John, November 18, 1529 (X, 552, 1): "We would prefer to die a hundred deaths to having our conscience reproach us that our Gospel had been the cause of any bloodshed or damage done on our account."

Sermon on 1 John 3, 21, A. D. 1529—1530 (IX, 1591, 68): "But with unbelief civil government has nothing to do."

"An Admonition to Receive the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord," 1530 (X, 15): "If any one wants to deny Christ, and become unchristian and remain an unbeliever, we let him alone, without laying constraint on him, nor do we bother ourselves about him, except that we say to him: 'He that believeth not shall be damned.' He will meet his judge and constrainer without fail; we are excused and have done our duty."

Exposition of the 82d Psalm, 1530 (V, 717, 52 f.): "Here the question arises whether they [the secular rulers] should also repress and punish heresies, since no one should and can be forced to believe. Here we must answer: First, some heretics are seditious, who publicly teach that no magistrate should be tolerated; likewise, that no Christian may hold a magisterial office; also, that one should possess no property, but desert wife and children, forsake house and home, or hold and have all things in common. Such are straightly and without any doubt to be punished by the magistrate, inasmuch as they openly oppose the civil laws and the powers that be, Rom. 13. For they are not simply heretics only, but as seditious they attack the powers that be, and their government and order. . . .

"Secondly, if any would teach contrary to a known article of faith which is clearly established in Scripture and received the world over by all Christendom, such as the children are taught in the Creed; *e. g.*, if any one would teach that Christ is not God, but a mere man, and the same as any other prophet, as the Turks and the Anabaptists hold: such should not be tolerated either, but punished the same as public profaners, for they, too, are not simply heretics only, but public blasphemers. Now it is clearly the duty of the magistrate to punish public blasphemers, as those are punished who in other respects curse, swear, reproach, revile, rail, slander, defame, etc. For such teachers dishonor the name of God by their blasphemy, and deprive their neighbor of his honor before men. Likewise the magistrate should also punish, or at least not tolerate, those who teach that Christ had not died for our sins, but that every one must render satisfaction for them himself. For that is also public blasphemy against the Gospel and a commonly received article of faith confessed by us in the Creed, where we say: 'I believe the forgiveness of sins,' and, 'I believe in Jesus Christ, who died, rose again,' etc.; likewise, whoever teaches that there is no resurrection of the dead, and no life everlasting nor hell, and the like; as the Sadducees and Epicureans taught, who are multiplying at the present time also among the great wiseacres. For by such action no one is forced to believe, for

he can still very well believe what he pleases. Only his teaching and blaspheming is forbidden, by which he means to take from God and the Christians their doctrine and Word, and wants to do this to their injury while enjoying their protection and sharing all their secular privileges. Let him remove to a place where there are no Christians, and do it there.

"In the third place, if it happens that in a parish, city, or dominion the Papists and Lutherans (as they are called) get to brawling and preach against each other with regard to some points of doctrine, both sides claiming to have the Scriptures on their side, I should still be unwilling to suffer such dissension, and my Lutherans also should willingly retire and keep silence if they noticed that people were unwilling to hear them, as Christ teaches Matt. 10, and wait to have themselves constrained to preach, as I do. For I quit without much ado if they are unwilling to hear me, and all my preaching and writing I had to do by constraint. But if neither party is willing to yield and keep silence, or perhaps cannot do so for reasons of office, then the magistrate should take action and hear the matter, and whichever side does not prove its point from Scripture should be bound over to silence. For it is not expedient that antagonistic preaching be permitted to prevail among the people of a parish, because it results in divisions, disturbances, hatred and envy, in other secular matters also.

"By none of these things is any one forced to believe, but the peace of the congregation is secured against those headstrong chaps."⁴)

Exposition of the 118th Psalm, June 13—26, 1530 (V, 1189, 25. 75): "The true Christian Church preaches the Word

4) As the purpose of this contribution is not to vindicate, but to present, Luther's views on freedom of conscience, we cannot enter into a detailed discussion of the foregoing quotation. We can merely suggest, first, that the reader study the opinions of eminent American jurists on the subject of blasphemy, and, secondly, that he bear in mind that Luther, who was a most practical man, wrote in Germany, not in the United States, in the sixteenth century, not in the twentieth. Both, place and time, — it was a time of tremendous changes and peculiar conditions, — necessitated the policy advocated by him.

of God, and forces no one to receive it; the person that refuses to believe it she lets alone, and withdraws herself from him, as Christ teaches Matt. 10 and 18, and as St. Paul does throughout the book of Acts, consigning them to God's judgment.

"We kill none on account of their doctrine, nor do we spoil any of their worldly goods, but let every one believe what he pleases; we do not lay constraint on them, we do not urge them by violence; we let the powers that be punish revolt, disturbances, and dissension, nor is it our purpose or plan to injure any one: but rather do we prevent all these things wherever and by whatever means we can possibly do so; we inculcate and preserve peace most zealously, and, on the other hand, suffer murder, bloodshed, poverty, and persecution most horribly, all these things being signs of a true spirit."

Comment on Matt. 7, 15, November 9, 1530; published in 1532 (VII, 625, 94): "Though dealing with a high hand, they can but take my life and goods; but my heart and faith they cannot take away from me by force."

"An Epistle of Warning to the People in Frankfurt-on-the-Main," A. D. 1533 (XVII, 2017, 22): "We force no one to confession, as all our writings attest; whoever does not want it, let him forbear; even as we do not care if any one will not have our Catechism and doctrine. In this no one constrains another. For, thank God, we are sufficiently taught that Christ, our Lord, will have no haughty, headstrong chap in His kingdom. Why, then, should we bring such haughty spirits into His kingdom by force?"

Letter to Lorenz Castner and his associates in Freiberg, February 11, 1536 (XX, 1758): "The magistrates would do well to attend to the matter, and bind this spirit over to silence. For he would like to plunge you at Freiberg into disaster."

Letter to King Christian of Denmark, December 2, 1536 (XXIb, 2127): "I am pleased that you have extirpated the bishops (who can not cease from persecuting God's Word and troubling the secular government)."

Letter to Melanchthon, April 8, 1540 (XXIb, 2445): "For although we poor sinners walk in the sinful flesh, still we are

pure from blood, yea, we hate those bloody men and the god of blood who possesses and drives them."

Against Hans Wurst, A. D. 1541 (XVII, 1326, 30): "No one can deny that we do not shed blood, murder, and hang people, and take revenge, as indeed we might have done and still might do."

Sermon on the Gospel for the 23d Sunday after Trinity, Matt. 22, 15—22; published in 1544 (XIIIa, 968, 16 ff.): "Caesar [the government] should not disturb in any way the government of God, and not prevent the people from rendering unto God the things which they should render to God. . . .

"If the secular rulers, however, should undertake to do this, the subjects should not obey them, but rather suffer whatever sufferings this may entail. . . .

"God will place body and goods, house and home under the power of Caesar, that only the heart be reserved to Himself and He may rule in the heart by His Word and Spirit." (Comp. XIIIa, 721, 21. 22.)

In his very last sermon, preached at Eisleben, February 15, 1546, three days before his death, the great champion of private judgment and liberty of conscience declared once more (XII, 1260, 14): "I allow that the emperor, king, pope, cardinal, princes, and lords are prudent and wise; but I will believe on my Lord Christ alone: He is my Master and Lord whom God has directed me to hear and to learn of Him what is true, divine wisdom. Whereat the pope and his partisans cry out: Nay, nay! you ought not do so; you ought to obey the rulers, and do what we bid you. True, say I, this I should do, but you must first agree with the Lord who here says: 'All things are delivered unto me of my Father,' etc. Therefore, dear pope, emperor, king, lord, and prince, do not come at me thus: I will gladly hearken to you in the worldly government, but your claim to sit in Christendom as lord, and to have authority to decide what I should believe and do, this claim I deny; for you wish to be prudent and wise in a matter where you are a fool, and where nothing has been revealed to you. For here is the Lord whom alone we should hear in these matters, as He also

says in this passage: 'Neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him.'...

"This, and much more, might be said on this Gospel, but I am too feeble; let this suffice. God give us grace that we receive His precious Word with thanksgiving, and increase and grow in the knowledge and faith of His Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, and continue steadfast in the confession of His holy Word unto the end. Amen."

St. Louis, Mo.

C. F. DREWES.

BOOK REVIEW.

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF MARTIN LUTHER, by *Preserved Smith*, Ph. D. Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston. 1911. \$3.50 net. XVI and 490 pages.

This biography of Luther is introduced by the publishers as "the most humanly interesting, as well as the latest and most authoritative." This statement is borne out by every chapter and page of Dr. Smith's most fascinating account of the Reformer's eventful life. First, his delineation of Luther is "most humanly interesting." He studies the man Luther, and his keen eye has observed a wealth of detail that exhibits the truly human, the intensely human, manner and fashion of Luther's actions. Luther is to the author always a great man, and his work epochal. To the last he keeps up his admiration for him: when the dead Luther is lowered into the tomb in the Castle Church at Wittenberg, the author still remembers that this is the place whence the words went forth that shook the world. But the actions of this man were just such as one would expect of such a man. What Dr. Smith says of Brother Augustine at the monastery of the Augustinian Hermits at Erfurt applies to Luther at every other stage of his life. He says: "Of course Luther's development was not completed at once. Even after the master-key had been found, the long struggle continued, and other factors entered in to modify and enrich his character. He entered the monastery to save his soul, and the struggle for peace took twelve long years before the monk was ripe for the great deeds he was called on to perform. No one can get even an idea of what the struggle cost him, save by reading after him the folios and quartos he perused, and trying to follow him in all that tangled labyrinth. And yet his development was perfectly normal and even. That his health suffered somewhat from asceticism

is undoubtedly true, but there were no morbid symptoms in his conversion. Comparing it to that of other famous Christians, there were no visions such as Loyola saw, and no moral breakdown such as that of Augustine. In those years of hardship, meditation, study, and thought he laid the foundation of that adamant character which stood unshaken amidst a tempest that rocked Europe to its base." This "adamantine character" in its "normal development" is throughout the subject of Dr. Smith's exhaustive study. The plan which he has adopted to make men see the truly human Luther is the happiest imaginable. He makes Luther tell his own life. In no extant biography of Luther—Michelet not excepted—is the vast correspondence of Luther used so extensively, and with such excellent critical acumen, as in this work of Dr. Smith. There is nothing labored and intricate in this Life of Luther. We have no doubt that it will become the favorite biography for the intelligent and cultured Christian layman. Dr. Smith, indeed, knows Luther also as an intensely religious man, a man of prayer, and faith, and full of works of righteousness. He knows him also as a great theologian. But this last feature is the least prominent in his account, and his estimate of Luther in this respect is subject to discount. For instance, Luther's attitude in the controversy with Erasmus has not been understood, especially his remarks on the sovereignty of the divine will in its dealings with men. The tendency of Luther's remarks on the canon of Scripture has been overdrawn, possibly under the unconscious influence of Twentieth Century Biblical criticism. Nor is the lasting worth of Luther's activity—what Lutherans call the evermore enduring element—properly appreciated. Nevertheless, Dr. Smith is so fair and unbiased in his general narrative and frequently defends Luther so ably against calumnies, that it is a continuous pleasure to follow him in his account. While his book will not supersede the works of Koestlin or Kolde, it possesses a merit distinctly its own, which will insure it an abiding place alongside of the books of these German scholars.—As to the other feature of Dr. Smith's work, which the publishers mention, there is no doubt that Dr. Smith's Life of Luther is "the latest and most authoritative." The bibliography appended at the end of the book covers 38 pages, and reveals the author's wide reading. Besides this he has searched the Berlin Royal Library, the Bodleian Library at Oxford, the British Museum, and other storehouses for valuable documentary evidence, and has enjoyed the immense privilege of conferring personally with leading scholars at home and abroad who are regarded as authorities on the history of Luther and his work.—In an Epilogue the author relates "The Last Years and Death of Luther's Wife."

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XVI.

JANUARY, 1912.

No. 1.

A FREE CHURCH IN A FREE COUNTRY.

Address at the Walther Centennial Celebration at the Light Guard Armory
at Detroit, Mich.¹⁾

FELLOW LUTHERANS:—

We are met to celebrate the dawn, a century ago, of a life that has proved eminently useful, chiefly to the American Lutheran Church, but in a larger view to the Church of Christ in all lands. Walther's uncompromising loyalty to the Holy Scriptures, which he accepted as verbally inspired; his clear and thoroughgoing distinction between man's estate by nature and by grace, under the Law and under the Gospel, through faith and through works; his powerful presentation of that article of the Christian religion with which the Church either stands or falls, the justification of a sinner before the tribunal of divine justice by grace through faith; his equally strong emphasis on the necessary sequel to justification, the sanctification of the justified sinner by daily repentance and renewal, and by holiness of life and conduct; his fearless application of the Word of God to the lives of Christians in all sorts of callings, avocations, and pursuits,—all these things surely merit the approbation of the entire Church.

There is, however, one feature that rises mountainlike out of the level plain of Walther's great life-work, and at the same time is so unique that I believe it deserves special consideration during these commemorative exercises. To this feature I shall, with your permission, limit my remarks.

1) Published by request of Pastoral Conference of Detroit.

The well-known organization which has sprung up in America principally through Walther's labors, the Missouri Synod, is a Lutheran Free Church. Viewed merely as such, without considering its present dimensions, it is without a parallel in the history of the Lutheran Church. Not that the Lutheran Church had not, from its beginning, been projected as a Free Church. In his teaching on the character and mission of the Church, Walther has said nothing but what Luther and the confessional writings of the Lutheran Church had laid down as the rule, on the authority of Scripture. However, every student of Lutheran history knows that, owing to unfavorable circumstances prevailing at the time, the Scriptural principles of the age of the Reformation were not at once reduced to practice. It was here, in America, that Lutheran teaching and, what comes to the same thing, Scriptural teaching, concerning the dignity and sovereignty of the local Christian congregation, the relation of the ministry to the laity, the rejection of all human authority when employed for the purpose of determining what Christians shall believe and do, or refuse to believe and do, the proper attitude of the Church to the State, and vice versa, has not only been accepted as a doctrine of the Christian religion, but has been made the very condition under which the Church here lives, and moves, and has its being. If we leave out of consideration a few minor instances where a condition like this has been attempted in other ages and outside of the Lutheran Church, such a thing has not happened since the days of the apostles and the early fathers, prior to the age of Constantine.

Americans probably feel little surprise at hearing this stated; for is not every church in our country a free church? True, yet there is a difference. The Lutheran Church in America rejoices, not only because it is become *de facto* a free church, but because such a condition accords perfectly with her Confessions, and is the very thing which she has always and everywhere advocated. The Lutheran Church in America desires no change whatever in present conditions.

This subject interests us both as Lutherans and Americans. I shall point out a few facts in the life-work of Walther that may show how we came to be what we are, an American Lutheran Free Church.

The beginnings of the society from which our organization has sprung are overcast with gloom. You remember the scene on board ship, when the Saxon emigrants met at the cabin of their leader Stephan, and signed a document which gave that man almost absolute power over them. Walther, with a few others, did not sign that document. Walther's Lutheran conscience revolted at the idea that he should surrender his God-given right of private judgment to any man. He perceived the hierarchical tendency in that move. That is the first intimation we have of a leading trait in the character of Walther, his abhorrence of man-power, of princely authority within the Church, to be wielded over the Church.

Walther has never claimed that it is wrong in principle for a Church to have bishops. He has, however, contended that bishops are not *juris divini*, by divine right. The Scriptural bishop, in Walther's view, is the pastor of the local congregation of Christians. He alone exists by divine right. All other functionaries of the Church are *juris humani*, are human creatures, which may or may not be called into existence, as the local congregation elects. They may also have their functions altered, yea, entirely abrogated, to suit the needs of a given time or place. Withal, they are mere contrivances for convenience; and their duty is to serve, not to rule.

Walther laid stress on the word of Christ: "One is your master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren." To him the spiritual privileges of a believer are a direct grant from Christ who has earned them by His living and dying. The exercise of these privileges is controlled solely by the Word of Christ. To make the possession of these privileges dependent upon the pleasure, and their exercise upon the dictate, of any man, was to Walther an affront offered to the Redeemer Himself. "Stand

fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage"—this saying of Paul came to be a settled principle of Walther.

This principle was applied without fear or favor to any hierarchical tendency which cropped out in the American Lutheran Church. It brought on the first great controversy which our Synod had to wage. Walther, and we with him, denied the right of a pastor to excommunicate a church-member upon the pastor's sole authority, the pastor's right to levy a church-tax, to issue ordinances, to set up church-customs, etc. Walther's most famous book, on the Church and the Ministry, was written in defense of his position, and attracted such wide attention that on account of it a European university, that of Goettingen, asked him to accept the degree of Doctor of Divinity.

The Missouri Synod was organized in 1847, chiefly through the instrumentality of Walther. The organization was not effected until after the jurisdiction of the body had been strictly defined. The organization was to be a federation of congregations, each of them retaining complete autonomy, and uniting with the other congregations merely for the purpose of achieving certain measures which the individual congregation could not hope to accomplish alone, such as, the carrying on of missions at home and abroad, the founding of schools for the training of ministers and minister's helpers, the publication of suitable denominational literature, the defense of the Confession of the Church in the forum of the general public, etc. The powers of the Synod were made merely advisory, it being left to the free choice of the congregations whether or not they would adopt any of the measures which the Synod at its stated conventions had resolved upon and recommended. The right of revision is an inalienable right of every Missouri congregation.

At these conventions the clergy and the laity are equally represented and have equal privileges of speech and vote.

Yea, suffrage lodges ultimately in the congregation; for a congregation temporarily without a pastor still may cast its vote, and ministers serving congregations not organically connected with the Synod have no vote.

Everything, thus, was done in the organization of the Missouri Synod to avoid the creation of a higher tribunal, a consistory, or ecclesiastical court, that would decree and determine matters for the congregations.

All this was a new venture in the American Lutheran Church. The oldest American Lutheran synod was not called a synod, but a ministerium, and most of the older Lutheran organizations in our country adopted the same designation. The very word "ministerium" tells a tale. It means that those organizations were federations of ministers in which the congregations had little representation that was of any importance. The example of the Missouri Synod has effected a noteworthy change in this respect. Congregational sovereignty is now an accepted fact and an acknowledged principle of polity in the American Lutheran Church; and the application of this principle, no doubt, has given the greatest impulse to the remarkable growth of our Church in this country during the last century.

Walther's position was subjected to severe criticism. It was held by some, that his teaching must necessarily weaken the influence of the ministry, that it would reduce the pastor to a mere puppet who must obey the beck and nod of his congregation, and that it must open the floodgates to congregational demagoguery and anarchy. Others held that Walther's position smacked of independentism and separatism. They feared that the right of private judgment would be used to the detriment of the unification of the Church as a whole and of the upbuilding of strong local congregations. Men would do under this teaching only what they pleased. As regards the synodical organization which Walther had effected, it was predicted that it would be short-lived. A synod without mandatory powers,

it was said, could not hope to accomplish anything; it would be a sort of ecclesiastical caucus, without authority to bind even its own members further than these chose to be bound.

Walther met all these arguments. He insisted that the ministry is by divine appointment. It is not optional with the congregation whether they will have a pastor or not, nor what they may demand of their pastor. The functions of the ministry are clearly stated in Scripture. These statements bind both the pastor and the congregation, and when the pastor acts within the limits of the divine Word, the congregation owes him obedience. On the other hand, it is the congregation which not only elects the pastor, but also dismisses him if he fails to meet the requirements of his sacred charge. Thus the rights of either side are fully secured by God's Word, and better guarantee it is impossible to offer. The relation between pastor and people, according to this teaching, is not determined after the fashion of a mere human agreement or contract, often limited as to time, but it is divinely regulated and safeguarded.

Subsequent events proved that Walther's position did not harm, but benefit the ministry. The so-called time-call, which had been a favorite practice in American Lutheran churches, went out of existence, and everywhere there was abundant evidence that the people cordially respected their ministers, just because they saw that these men did not mean to domineer over them, but to serve them.

As to the separatistic tendency of his position, Walther set to work to show how a congregation, that is, a Christian congregation in truth and deed, ought to be constituted in accordance with the teaching of Scripture. His second best and greatest book was written for this purpose. It explains in two parts: 1. the rights and privileges of membership in a local Christian congregation; 2. the duties which result from such membership. In Walther's estimation church-membership in a Christian congregation is a holy affair, a sacred trust, a grave responsibility. Walther meant to raise up an intelligent laity that would know how to apply the grand prerogatives with

which they had become vested by the Lord Jesus; a laity that would prize very highly the boon of Christian union and fellowship on the basis of a common understanding of the revealed truth; a laity, moreover, that would unitedly strive for "whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; and if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, would think on these things." His book is an exquisite manual of church-membership, and it would be most appropriate if in this year of jubilee we would all take up this noble book and study it again.

The test of actual experience also bore out Walther's claim that his principles were not only true by the rule of the divine Word, but also practicable. Strong, well-informed, conscientious, and energetic congregations grew up under the application of these principles from the Atlantic to the Pacific, in the North and in the South.

Lastly, as to the feebleness and insufficiency of the synodical organism which he helped to erect, Walther soon could point to the faith-compelling argument of actual results. The Synod which had seemed so loosely bound together, and so limited as to its powers of jurisdiction, came to be the largest and most powerful Lutheran body in America. From a handful of delegates that met at Chicago to effect the organization, the Missouri Synod has grown to a communicant membership of over half a million, representing 878,654 souls. It carries on its synodical roster the names of 3767 congregations and missions served by its pastors, and the number of all clergymen organically connected with the Synod is 2213, inclusive of the teachers at the Synod's colleges and seminaries.

In his opening address before the second convention of the Synod, in 1848, Walther said: "It is possible that we are all more or less stirred with anxious concern when we reflect that our deliberations may prove futile, since according to our synodical Constitution we have merely advisory powers, merely the power of the Word and of moral suasion. Our Constitu-

tion does not permit us to issue decrees, to proclaim ordinances and laws, and to hand down legal decisions enjoining upon our congregations certain actions and compelling them to submit. Our Constitution does not create us a sort of consistory, or supreme court, set up above our congregations. It leaves to the congregations the most perfect liberty in all things, the Word of God, faith and love alone excepted. According to our Constitution we are not above but within our congregations, and at their side as aids. Does this arrangement, now, deprive us of all possibility to exert a thorough and salutary influence upon our congregations? Have we, by adopting a Constitution such as ours, made ourselves a mere shadow of a synod? Shall we not, in a mutual relation such as we have entered into, weary ourselves with labors that may easily prove utterly lost because nobody is compelled to submit to our resolutions?" Walther negatives all these queries emphatically, and then goes on to show: "Why we should, and can, carry on the work of the Lord cheerfully, although we have no other authority than that of the Word of God." He shows that Christ has given to His ministers no other power than that of the Word, and that this is amply sufficient for the upbuilding of the Church. He says: "When the minister is given only the power of the Word, however, that power in its full compass; when the congregation hearing the Word of Christ from its minister receives it as the Word of God, then the proper relation exists between the pastor and the congregation. Then the pastor serves the congregation, not as a hireling, but as an ambassador of the Most High, not as a servant of men, but as a servant of Christ, and teaches, warns, reproves in Christ's stead. Just where these conditions prevail, the apostolic injunction is properly heeded: 'Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves.' The more clearly a congregation perceives that the man who presides over its affairs in the Lord desires nothing but that the congregation should yield obedience to Christ and His Word, the more it becomes convinced that the pastor does not wish to domineer, but himself

jealously guards the liberty of the congregation; the more ready it will be to listen to his salutary counsels, even in matters that God has left optional. . . . This same prospect of being able to exert a wholesome influence our synodical body has, provided it does not seek to accomplish anything except by the power of the Word. True, we expect conflicts because of this position of ours, but they will not be such humiliating conflicts about trifles as usually arise from disputes regarding human ordinances, but they will be holy conflicts, in defense of the Word of God, and of the honor and the kingdom of God. And the more our congregations come to see that we do not mean to exercise any other power than the divine power of the Word, which saves all who believe it, the more they will become accessible to our counsels. Those who do not love the Word will, indeed, turn from us; but those who love the Word will regard communion with us as a comforting refuge. When they have freely adopted our resolutions, they will not bear them as a foreign yoke that has been laid upon them, but they will esteem them a blessed and gracious expression of brotherly love, and will maintain, champion, and defend them as their own."

The Saxon emigrants and their later associates had come out of the German state-churches. They found conditions prevailing in America which entirely eliminated the jurisdiction of the State from the affairs of the Church. It was these conditions that had attracted them to this country in the first place. They rejoiced in the separation of Church and State, which is a covenanted article of the American Constitution.

They defended this principle of true statecraft from the view-point of Scripture. Walther has frequently in his writings sketched the distinct character and functions of the Church and the State. He regards the authority of the State as temporal, corporal, visible, external, that of the Church as internal, spiritual, invisible. Earthly, or political, citizenship must be indiscriminately extended to the evil and the good, to Chris-

tians as well as non-Christians, to believers as well as to unbelievers. But church-membership can be consistently granted only to those who hear and believe the Word of the Good Shepherd. The aim of the State is to secure for its citizens conditions of peace and prosperity, and to protect them in their temporal interests and possessions. The aim of the Church is to reconcile men with their God, secure them against sin, death, devil, and hell, and save them eternally. The rule by which the State is guided in its actions is reason and common sense; that of the Church is the written revelation of God. The State makes laws to meet existing conditions; the Church makes no laws, but merely reiterates and applies the eternal laws of God. The State punishes acts that are evil outright; the Church places its censure also on the evil disposition of the heart. The State permits everything that is conducive to its own interests; the Church permits only what God has sanctioned or left optional. The State exacts obedience on the ground of the authority vested in it; the Church demands obedience only on the authority of Christ. The State employs force and coercive means to accomplish its ends; the Church never employs force. The State has for its component parts those who are in authority and exercise the functions of government, and those who are subject to the powers that be; in the Church there is no such distinction between a governing class and one that is governed. Jesus said to His disciples: "Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion, and they that are great exercise authority; but it shall not be so among you."

Because of these essential differences, Walther held, with the Bible and the Augsburg Confession, that State and Church must not be commingled. We Christians, who hold citizenship both in the State and the Church, must accord to each its due, rendering unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's. Walther held that the State cannot, and must not, be governed according to the principles of the Church, nor the Church according to the principles of the State.

As a practical result of this teaching, Walther opposed two evil tendencies which have in every age wrecked either the Church, or the State, or both. On the one hand, he held that the Church must never seek to gain its ends by the aid of the State, so that the State virtually becomes a subordinate functionary of the Church, and the leaders of the Church act not only as guides in the spiritual, but also in the temporal affairs of their flocks, and are not content with being simply pastors, but seek to obtain political influence, and become statesmen and politicians. This evil, which is known under the name of Papocaesarism, Walther fought with resolute spirit. On the other hand, Walther held that the Church must never suffer itself to become a political fixture, by which the State carries its purposes into effect. Christian pastors must not make policemen, sheriffs, prosecuting attorneys of themselves, nor claim recognition and support from the State on the ground of their being churchmen. Walther warned also against this evil, which is known as Caesaropapism, in many of his public utterances.

In view of the dangers with which the democratic institutions of our American Republic are threatened from both the directions aforementioned, we may say that Walther has placed our whole country under obligation by his able and consistent defense of the principle of the separation of Church and State. Walther loved America and her liberties, and often spoke of our government in words of high praise. "Our government," he said on one occasion, "is really what the prophet Isaiah said a government should be, a nursing mother of the Church. For our government, as its office requires, powerfully protects us against every form of external violence, against the bloodthirstiness of Antichrist and his henchmen, and against the murderous spirit of the atheists of these last sad days of apostasy."

It goes without saying that Walther's persistent opposition to any effort by which it was sought to erect a human authority within and above the Church, and his maintaining to the last legitimate conclusion the sovereignty of the Christian congrega-

tion, caused much strife. We do not regret this strife. No great and good cause in this world ever came to be accepted without conflict.

We have been warned that we must not deify Walther. We assure every one that we are fully aware of Walther's human frailties and shortcomings. We know that he did not think of himself except as a poor sinner, always in need of the forgiving and sanctifying grace of God. We have little interest in the mere man Walther. We honor, however, at this centenary, the principles for which he contended. These principles we mean, by the help of God, to maintain after him.

Walther is now removed from the strife of tongues and from the toil and worry of the Church militant. While he was with us, he was a tower of strength. Let us make his deeds commemorate him by making them an illustrious model for our own work, and thus let us perpetuate his work in ours. His memory shall remain green among us as long as there shall be found among us men who appreciate the religious, scriptural, the confessional, Lutheran, position occupied by the great American Lutheran, Carl Ferdinand Wilhelm Walther.

ADDRESS AT THE WALTHER ANNIVERSARY.

We have met to-day to praise God for a great gift to our Church, by commemorating the life and work of a Lutheran pilgrim father, a great theologian, a leader and organizer of the Church, and a true American.

From the days of our childhood, we have heard and learned, spoken and sung, about those pilgrim fathers who, three centuries ago, fled from religious oppression and landed on the shores of New England, there to serve God according to the dictates of their conscience.

Three fourths of a century ago, a similar band of pilgrims landed at New Orleans and, amid similar hardships, sought a new home in this land of freedom, escaping from religious op-

pression and persecution, looking for the same liberty to edify themselves and worship God without interference from any civil authority,—the fathers of your synod, among them a young man less than thirty years old: Carl Ferdinand Wilhelm Walther.

In a short time, this young man was to become the leader, the spiritual father, of those pilgrim fathers.

You know their history. In the new home, new oppression and tyranny, worse than the persecutions by the government of the old Fatherland, were their lot. The man at the head, on whom they looked as their "bishop," attempted to bind the colonists to obey his dictates as divine even beyond and contrary to the Word of God, robbing them of that freedom of conscience vouchsafed to all believers by the evangel of God.

However, by the strong hand of God, who bringeth to light the things that are hidden in darkness, the hierarchy of Stephan was overthrown. But what, now, was to take its place? The pilgrims, Walther with them, were sorely puzzled and troubled. "What is our position before God? Are we still His children? still Christians? Lutherans? still a Church of God? Have we a rightful ministry amongst us?" These and similar questions arose. But the pilgrims went to the fountain of all divine truth. Walther came to the front, and, with convincing clearness, gave answer to those questions from the Word of God, at the same time showing that the testimony of the Lutheran Church and its confessions is in full accord with that Word.

The great theologian had been developed. His early training had been such that he was a master in clearness of diction. And his own spiritual experience made his words a personal testimony to what he expounded as divine truth.

Clearly and convincingly he showed that the grace of God in Christ Jesus, and that alone, is our salvation and comfort; that on it only our faith may and must rest, and never, not in the least part, on any man or any thing we can do. He showed that the Bible, because it is the Word of God and the only message of God to mankind, is and must be the supreme

authority deciding all questions of faith and Christian living; that the teachings of the Bible are for all time the settled truth of God; that doctrines, theories, evolutions of dogmas, church laws, and constitutions made by bishops, synods, general assemblies, ecclesiastical councils going beyond that Word are only human, and can never rightfully be of binding authority over our conscience. He brought out that truth of the Bible and the Augsburg Confession, that "the Church is the congregation of saints and true believers," that, therefore, every local congregation gathering about the Word and sacraments is truly God's Church, having authority over all its spiritual and temporal affairs, especially that, to call and install its own ministers and preachers; that Christians as such have no lord over them, and no mediator before God, but Christ.

These and other forgotten truths Walther again brought forward, taught, and defended them to the end of his days, thus proving himself a great theologian in the best sense of that title: a man taught of God and able to teach and convince others.

But there were others besides Walther. I shall only mention some of the fathers of your own Missouri Synod. It would be an injustice to the memory of such names as Fuerbringer, Brohm, Buenger, Loeber, Keyl, Wyneken, Guenther, Schaller, and others, to call Walther, without restriction, the greatest theologian, *the* theologian of the nineteenth century.

What made his life so important, gave him that prominent place in the history of the Lutheran Church in our country, and must make his memory especially precious to true Lutherans, was, that God not only made him a great theologian, giving him a clear knowledge of divine truth, and not only placed him as a teacher for his own small flock, but set him to be a leader and organizer in the Church at large, a champion of Lutheran doctrine and practice, whose voice was heard throughout the land, a victorious defender of the faith delivered to the saints.

There was a Lutheran Church in this country before Wal-

ther's time. Its beginnings reach back to the days of the very first settlements. Exactly a century ahead of Walther, the patriarch Heinrich Melchior Muehlenberg had gathered the scattered Lutherans in the East, strengthened, taught, organized, and defended them, and had become a tower of strength for the Lutheran Church of the Colonies.

But the War of the Revolution, the so-called age of reason, the influence of European rationalism, the neglect of sound doctrine, of carefully training ministers and teachers for the Church, of thorough indoctrination of the rising generations, the adoption of "new methods" considered better than the old and plain teaching and preaching of God's Word, — all these had wrought sad havoc in the Lutheran Church of the United States. With the exception of a few, scattered men and settlements, the Church was Lutheran in name only.

And here the great life-work of Walther was to be done. His church at St. Louis, to which he had recently been called, helped him to start a periodical which was to expound and defend Lutheran doctrine, and it became the means of rallying faithful Lutherans beyond the confines of St. Louis; of arousing Lutheran consciousness in the hearts of those bearing this honored name throughout the country; of strengthening the weak; of showing what genuine Lutheranism is and stands for. When that great, truly evangelical missionary Wyneken at Baltimore received the first copy, he exclaimed, "Thank God! There are still some Lutherans in America." New hopes for our Church were kindled. The night of rationalism, indifference, and weakness was passing, and a new day dawned.

Through the medium of Walther's publications, men who desired to remain true to the Lutheran Confessions became acquainted with each other. They met. They strengthened one another. And others followed their example. You know the result: a strong, self-conscious Lutheran Church in the United States gathered in your own and other synods.

And Walther was a chief and most energetic organizer and builder for the future of the Church. The colleges and

seminaries for training our own ministers and teachers; the system of Christian schools for our children, looking to the future, so that the coming generations may be both good citizens and loyal, intelligent members and lovers of their Church; the efficient handling of the problems of home missions; the publication of Lutheran books and periodicals, including that splendid and only American edition of Luther's complete works, were largely brought about through Walther's untiring zeal and the inspiring testimony of his tongue and pen.

Time does not permit me to enlarge on these points, or to speak about what our older brethren who knew Walther personally tell us of his ability as a public speaker; of his personal fervor, which communicated his enthusiasm to his pupils, students, and hearers; of his kindliness and humility joined with decisiveness and determination to uphold the truth of God and maintain His glory amongst men.

I shall only, and very briefly, add one point which often is, but ought not to be, forgotten. Walther, while his influence gradually grew world-wide, was a true, enthusiastic, patriotic American. Indeed, he was not born in our country. As stated at the beginning, he came here a stranger and a pilgrim like the pilgrim fathers of Massachusetts. But he understood what those New England fathers did not understand. We sing of this "sweet land of liberty" as the "land of the pilgrims' pride." Alas, those older pilgrims did not know what a land of real liberty is. They set up a form of government under the laws of which every citizen was to believe and practice religion and live according to *their* views. The same persecution they had escaped from they made others feel.

It was different with Walther. His and his fellow pilgrims' protest was that no civil government should have any authority to interfere in religious and ecclesiastical affairs. And he prized our country above all in the world because of the religious liberty guaranteed to its citizens. He called this the golden crown of all our liberties, the brightest star in the banner of our country. Read his fourth of July oration pub-

lished in one of the collections of his addresses, and you cannot but be inflamed with a holy fire of true patriotism and love for our country. Walther may have made mistakes according to the views of some of us; but he had become a true American of the best type.

We hear much in these days about great Americans and great German-Americans; the names of some of them are known to everybody. Most of those men are only results; but men like Walther are moving causes. Those men represent ripe fruits of patriotism which our nation enjoys; but the deep roots from which the fruit-bearing trees grow are, though hardly noticed by the multitude, in the hearts of such men as understand and fully appreciate what God in His goodness has given our country as His best gift: religious freedom.

Hence we all have just cause to celebrate this day, both as Lutherans and as Americans. And I wish to state at this point that I have been instructed by unanimous vote of the Milwaukee Conference of the Wisconsin Synod to say to you, our brethren in the faith, that we rejoice with you. We thank God with you that He gave to the Church the services of such a man as Walther was, a staunch Lutheran, a spiritual leader and builder, a true American.

And now, as we look to the future, we can see two possibilities. One is, that we forget to appreciate the heritage of our Lutheran fathers, and become indifferent toward the peculiarly precious gifts bestowed on our Church by the mercy of God; that we gradually lose the way of truth in the maze of unbelief, false doctrine, and religious indifference abroad in our land and time, becoming like a ship without compass and rudder, deprived of our identity and distinctive character as the Church of the Reformation, at last swallowed up by the powers of darkness. The other possibility is, that we continue in the Word of Truth, in the living faith in, and strict adherence to the doctrine of, the grace of God,—a free Church proclaiming the truth in a free country, a growing blessing to this beloved land of ours.

Briefly, the one possibility is, that we forget, the other, that we remember, the benefits God bestowed on us by giving our Church such men as Walther.

My brethren, it is for us to say, — and God grant according to His grace that we all, young and old, rich and poor, laymen and ministers, answer aright, — What shall the future be?

Milwaukee, October 22, 1911.

C. GAUSEWITZ.

THE HIERARCHY.

In pagan Rome democracy was turned into a monarchy.

Christ said: "Ye know that the rulers of the nations lord it over them. Not so shall it be among you," Matt. 20, 20—28. And so the first churches were pure democracies; they were congregationalists. But the papal church duplicated in its own organization the aristocracy and monarchy of the world, and therewith prepared a home for the despotic spirit within the edifice dedicated to democracy. And an institution will constantly evoke the spirit that fits it. The Catholic Church, by its organization, tends to keep alive the despotic spirit of decadent Roman civilization in which it originated. The revolution was due partly to the ambition and lust for power inherent in human nature, but mainly to the assimilating influence of secular institutions. (Hatch, *Organization of the Early Christian Churches*.) The churches, step by step, copied the forms of organization prevalent about them. (Harnack, *Contemp. Review*, Dec., 1904.) The centralization of church power in the clergy and the bishop in the third century took place simultaneously with a centralization of power in the organization of the empire. (Schiller, *Roem. Kaiserzeit*, I, 911 ff.) The Church poured its organization into the molds furnished by imperial Rome, and when the mold was broken and crumbled away, the Church in its system of government stood erect as an ecclesiastical duplicate of the empire. (Rauschenbusch, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, pp. 190—192.)

A diocese was a political division of several provinces ruled by a prefect; the Church adopted the name and thing, and had a patriarch rule several provinces. (*R. E.*³, III, 247; V, 402.)

MARIOLATRY.

In Babylon the One Great Invisible God was "to be worshiped through silence alone;" he was elbowed out by the Mother and Child, and the worship of them spread into many countries. In Egypt they were known as Isis and Osiris, in India, as Isi and Iswara; in Asia, as Cybele and Deoius; in Greece, as Ceres with the babe, or as Irene with Plutus; in Rome, as Fortuna and Jupiter the Boy. Even the Jews at one time worshiped this "Queen of Heaven," Jer. 44, 15—17.

This paganism crept into Romanism. Instead of being cast out, her name only was changed to the Virgin Mary and her Child, and she was worshiped with the same idolatrous feeling by professing Christians as formerly by open pagans. As a result, at Nicaea, in 325, the Melchite section from Egypt "held that there were three persons in the Trinity, the Father, the Virgin Mary, and Messiah, their Son."

Toward the end of the fourth century "Priestesses of Mary" arose and gave her the worship of Demeter Kalligeneia, a festival of seven days with processions of decorated wagons, flowers in the hand, and wheaten cakes in honor of the virgin mother.

Bishop Epiphanius of Constantia opposed this divine honor given to a woman; so did Bishop Nestorius of Constantinople; St. Augustine warned the people that "nothing created is to be worshiped by man."

In spite of these protests this idolatry spread. In Rome, Mary was given the temple of the Bona Dea, in Katania that of Ceres, in Syracuse that of Minerva, etc., and she was called Bona Dea.

Since the fifth century they celebrated the Annunciation of Mary and the Purification of Mary, since the seventh cen-

tury the Assumption of Mary, and Gelasius, in 687, ordered a splendid procession.

In 1854, by Pius IX, the holy Virgin Mary was declared immaculately conceived, just as in pagan Rome Proserpina, the daughter of Ceres, was "the holy virgin," not only free from actual sin, but "pure in essence and immaculately conceived."

In Lisbon, "To the virgin goddess of Loretto, the Italian race, devoted to her *divinity*, have dedicated this temple." Liguori says: "Mary so loved the world as to give her only-begotten Son for us." "The Blessed Virgin had to be raised to a sort of equality with the Divine Persons." Cardinal Manning heartily recommends this book to his people for their devotions.

In the "Paradisus Sponsi et Sponsae," the author of "Pancarpium Marianum" addresses Mary, "Thy beloved Son did sacrifice His flesh; thou thy soul—yea, both body and soul." Mary a greater savior than the Savior! Really the only savior—for Pope Gregory calls her "Our greatest hope; yea, the sole ground of our hope." And Pius X lately called her "conredemptrix," co-redeemer.

Like the Bona Dea, or like Venus, Mary helps at childbirth and in curing fevers. In Rome is a church bearing the name Santa Maria Febrifuga. In Paris, Notre Dame de Lorette looks after the interests of a section of the *demimonde*. In the Campagna and the Abruzzi she protects the bandits.

Madonna, My Lady, was the title of the pagan goddess Cybele, and Madonna is the title of the papal goddess Mary. March 25, the pagan festival day of Cybele, became the papal festival "Lady Day" of the Virgin Mary. The pagan "Queen of heaven" and "Star of the sea" is none other than the papal "Queen of heaven" and "Star of the sea." As the pagan goddess has blue eyes and golden hair and a fair complexion, is "gold-enthroned" and "crowned with stars," so the papal goddess. (Hislop.)

As the heathen had a curious custom of abusing the Bona Dea, so the modern popish heathen also abuse the Virgin Mary. Cardinal Bellarmine writes: What a multitude of Catholics there are "who say the Virgin is the mother of our Lord, yet do not fear blasphemously to call her whore" (*meretricem*). (B. Willard-Archer.)

The worship of the Egyptian Isis, the "mother of God," was fashionable and widespread among the pagan Romans under the earlier emperors; under the papal Romans she is worshiped as the Madonna, the ruling figure of Roman Catholicism. (Chamberlain, *Foundations*, II, 28, quoting Flinders Petrie.)

SAINTS.

The Hindus affirm that "God is one without a second." They add that the One has manifested himself in millions of forms. In addition to these divine beings, saints and heroes have been raised to a position of demigods, to whom worship is rendered equal to that of the gods themselves. This is justified on the ground that their prayers will be helpful. Afraid to go to the Divine Being direct, they try to interest these friends at court on their behalf. As a practical result the One is neglected, and the saints are worshiped.

The practice of raising the spirits of the departed into demigods was frequent in Europe before the Christian age. Whilst the greater gods were common to Rome and other nations, each district had its own local deities. To these were added the *manes*, the spirits, of their ancestors. Later on the emperors, dead and living, were placed among the gods. Apuleius says: "There are certain middle divinities between high heaven and this nether earth by whom the prayers and merits of men are carried up to the gods and their favors down to us."

Though the Bible says: "Thou shalt worship the Lord, thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve," the Church of Rome teaches: "The saints, reigning together with Christ, offer to God their prayers for men; and it is good and useful to invoke them with supplications."

As a practical result, God is neglected, and the saints are worshiped. In the Cathedral of Canterbury was a shrine of Jesus Christ, another of the Virgin Mary, and another of Thomas-a-Becket. On a certain day, when the offerings were taken out, St. Thomas' box contained £100; the Virgin's, £10; the Savior's—none!

In the Cathedral of Lucca is an altar to "Christo liberatori ac Deis Tutelaribus"—To Christ, the Deliverer, and to the Guardian Deities. The very words used by the heathen are here used by the papists.

The hymn addressed to St. Rosalia, the protectress of Palermo, is almost identical in spirit with what was commonly sung to heathen guardians of cities.

The Pantheon, built for all the gods and the deified Caesars, was dedicated to St. Mary and all the martyrs by Boniface IV, in 607. Gregory IV made November 1 the festival of all saints, and Hadrian, in 880, began to canonize the saints, since 1159 the exclusive privilege of the Pope.

The heathen venerated the ashes of their heroes, but the Christians did it so much more that the heathen disparaged the Christians as "Cineraries."

Leo the Great speaks of Christians in Rome who first worshiped the rising sun, doing homage to the pagan Apollo, before going to the basilica of St. Peter. Eusebius of Caesarea justified the worship of saints by quoting Hesiod, a pagan poet, and Plato, a pagan philosopher.

Theodoret boldly said the Lord had raised the martyrs to the place of the heathen gods.

The Emperor Julian and Libanius scoffed at Christians for worshiping, not one living God, but many dead men.

Tertullian said as early as about 200: "I see no difference between the opinion they have of their saints and that which the Gentiles have of their *divi*." Augustine lets a heathen ask, "Wherefore must we forsake gods which the Christians themselves worship with us?"

The worship of the papal saints was introduced to overcome the pagan saints. Gregorius Thaumaturgos did so; Cyrill of Alexandria overcame Isis with the aid of Cyrill and John; Gregory of Tours relates that a bishop of Gaul introduced the cult of Hilary of Poitiers to drive out some old pagan cult.

Westropp and Wake, in their "Ancient Symbol Worship," say: "Dionysius, the god of the mysteries, reappears as St. Denys in France, St. Liberius, St. Eleutherius, and St. Bacchus; there is also a St. Mithra; and even Satan, prince of shadows, is revered as St. Satur and St. Swithin. The holy virgin Astraea or Astarte, whose return was announced by Vergil in the days of Augustus, as introducing a new golden age, now under her old designation of Blessed Virgin and Queen of Heaven, receives homage as 'the one whose sole divinity the whole orb of the earth venerates.' The Mother and Child, the latter adorned with the nimbus of the ancient sun-gods, are now the objects of veneration as much as were Ceres and Bacchus, or Isis and Horus, in the mysteries. Nuns abounded alike in Christian and Buddhist countries, as they did formerly in Isis-worshipping Egypt."

If you have a fever, you pray to Petronilla; if a sore throat, to Blasius; if toothache, to Apollonia; if gall-stones, to Liborius. In order to protect your sheep, you pray to Wendelin; your geese, to Gallus; your horses, to Leonard; your pigs, to Eulogius. Aloysius is the patron saint of students, St. Catherine of scholars and preachers. Formerly Apollo helped in fevers; now St. Sebastian does that work.

St. Cecilia is the patron of musicians; St. Luke, of artists; St. Peter, of fish dealers; Noah, of winegrowers; St. Crispus, of cobblers; St. Theodorus takes the place of Romulus in healing the sick; Saints Cosmas and Damianus are the successors of Aesculapius. St. Anna, Mary's mother, helps at childbirth; St. Anthony helps to find lost articles, and cures certain an inflammation of the skin; St. Lucia cures eye troubles; St. Guthrac cures toothache. In Brittany, St. Erbot

cured the mange. In Saragossa St. Martin looked after domestic animals, which were driven three times around in the church at half a *real* per animal! St. Florian is good against fire; Rochus, against the pest; Isidor, for agriculture; Wendelin, for sheep; Leonard, for cattle; Apollonia, for toothache.

John Nepomuk is worshiped, though he never existed; but that is a minor matter.

Seymour, in his "Evenings with the Romanists," says under Constantine many merely changed "the names of Jupiter to Peter, or Juno to Mary, still worshipping their old divinities under new names, and even retaining old images that were baptized with Christian names. This is apparent in the writings of those times, and was thought a measure of wisdom, a stroke of profound policy, as tending to produce a uniformity of religion among the unthinking masses. The invocations of Juno have been transferred to Mary; the prayers to Mercury have been transferred to Paul. We see not how the substitution of the names of Damian or Cosmo, for those of Mercury or Apollo, or how the substitution of the names of Lucy or Cecelia, for those of Minerva or Diana, can alter the idolatrous character of the practice. In some instances they have not even changed the names, and Romulus and Remus are still worshiped in Italy, under the more modern names of St. Romulo and St. Remugio. . . . Even Bacchus is not without his votaries, under the ecclesiastical name of St. Bacco. The principle and practice of papal Rome are identical with the principle and practice of pagan Rome."

SAINTHOOD.

The Eremites of Egypt, the Essenes and Therapeutae retired from the world and all useful work into caves; vowed chastity, poverty, and obedience; dressed in skins or coarsest cloth; scourged themselves with whips; spent much time in silence; went from house to house with sacks on their backs, begging bread, wine, and all kinds of food. Precisely the same customs prevail in India and Siam.

The priests of Isis whipped themselves. Seneca says of this custom in pagan Rome: "If there be any gods that desire to be worshiped after this manner, they do not deserve to be worshiped at all, since the very worst of tyrants, though they have sometimes torn and tormented people, yet have never commanded men to torture themselves."

The flogging was so severe as to draw blood, which was caught up in the palms and, with shouting of prayers, was held up to the deity.

Minucius Felix says about 220: "You pour out your blood before your god, you invoke him by the gaping of your wounds. Who sees not that they who do these things are mad?"

Yet the Romish Church adopted also this insanity.

Polydorus Vergil writes: "Those whom you see in the processions walking in order, with faces covered, their shoulders torn, while they scourge themselves with whips, like rueful penitents, have simply copied the ancient Romans, who, when they celebrated the feast called Lupercalia, marched thus masked and naked through the streets, their shoulders lacerated with whips. And if we must go farther to seek the origin of this verberation, I will affirm it to be derived from the Egyptians, who, as Herodotus tells us, used to sacrifice a cow to the great devil (Isis), and while the offering was burning, beat themselves with rods."

The last public appearance of the Flagellants took place in Spain, in 1820.

A large realistic picture of the Flagellants by Carl Marr may be seen in the Milwaukee Auditorium.

Julius Caesar, it is said, crawled up to the Capitol on his knees to avert an evil omen; the same is said of the Emperor Claudius. Juvenal speaks of a woman seeking forgiveness of sins on this wise: "She will break the ice and go into the river in the depth of winter, dip herself three times in the Tiber at early dawn, and then, naked and shivering, crawl on her bleeding knees over the whole extent of the Campus Martius."

St. Jerome declares, with a thrill of admiration, that he had seen a monk, who, for thirty years, had lived on a small portion of barley bread and muddy water; another, who lived in a hole, and never ate more than five figs for his daily repast; a third, who cut his hair only on Easter Sunday, who never washed his clothes, who never changed his tunic till it fell to pieces, who starved himself till his eyes grew dim, and his skin like a pumice stone, and whose merits, shown by his austerities, Homer himself would be unable to recount.

St. Simeon Stylites carried this madness in misery to the limit; he began by being tied to a pillar till the cords cut his flesh and caused it to rot; he ended by standing on a 60-foot high pillar for thirty years, exposed to every change of climate, always swaying his body in prayer. For centuries bishops held up this craziness as a model to be imitated.

MONKS.

The Buddhist monasticism, especially in Thibet, with its vows of celibacy, poverty, and obedience, its common meals, readings, and various pious exercises, bears such a remarkable resemblance to that of the Roman Catholic Church that Roman missionaries thought it could be only explained as a diabolical imitation. But the original always precedes the caricature. The Pythagoreans were a kind of monastic society. Plato is at the bottom of Gnostic and Manichean asceticism, and influenced Origen and the Alexandrian school.

In heathen Rome the chief gods had their "monks," who lived in "convents," took certain "vows," called each other "brother," etc. Of these the Diales and Vestals were wealthy; the others were such great beggars that their number had to be limited "as they impoverish families and teach superstition," as Cicero writes. Apuleius, in "The Golden Ass," speaks with equal contempt of their lazy greed.

As in pagan Rome, so in papal Rome.

Satan had his devoted widows, and his virgin priestesses, and should not Christ have the like? So Tertullian thought.

Clemens Alexandrinus, in "Stromata," Bk. III, says the Church borrowed the institute of religious celibacy from the heathen worship; but he calls it a characteristic of Antichrist to forbid marriage. Would men be holier than the Lord, and reprove the apostles? (F. Taylor, *Ancient Christianity*, pp. 138. 166.)

Ruffner and many others think heathenism the source of monasticism. Calvin and many others see in monasticism an apostasy from apostolic Christianity plainly foretold by Paul in 1 Tim. 4, 3.

Jovinian, Helvidius, and Vigilantius vigorously opposed the introduction of monasticism.

Polydore Vergil, an Italian bishop of Bath and Wells, a learned antiquary, writes in the 16th century: "There were among the ancients companies of people who, under the pretext of religion, strolled from province to province, extorting money and other things; they carried with them images of their *divi*, or saints, persuading the simple folk that they would be propitious to those that gave something and kissed the image. And there is at this time a set of cheats, enemies of work, the more inwardly depraved as they endeavor to show outward sanctity, perfect imitators of the goddess' priests, who, with fraudulent piety, calling themselves the servants of all the saints, fully trained to all sorts of imposture, go rambling about the towns and villages, begging of the simple countrymen, some for the building of a church, some for clothes or food for the poor, others for the redemption of captives, some again for the bringing up of foundling children. By these means they get from one a sheep, from another wool, a lamb, from others a hen, eggs, bacon, and from another cheese or flax, etc. And the better to deceive, they draw from a box something they say is the relic of a saint or an apostle's signature, or a letter worn out with age and dirty with much handling, and to whomsoever gives them something they offer these things to kiss, promising for their gifts eternal life." (Lib. VII, c. 6. B. W.-A., p. 143.)

Pachomius was a monk of Serapis in Egypt, and later became a Christian and the founder of the cloister.

Tertullian (160—240) says in his "Apology" (XLII): "We are not Indian Brahmins or Gymnosophists, dwellers in woods, or exiles from life. . . . We sojourn with you in the world."

The "De Singularitate Clericorum," ascribed to Cyprian, illustrates the general dissatisfaction occasioned by the proposal for monastic insulation.

NUNS.

In Scandinavia the priestesses of Freya were generally king's daughters who watched the sacred fire and were bound to perpetual virginity. In Peru they had such nuns, who were buried alive if detected in violating their vow of chastity. In Athens there were virgins maintained at public expense, who were bound to single life. In pagan Rome the Vestal virgins tended the sacred fire, and they were buried alive if found unchaste.

Papal Rome introduced these nuns from pagan Rome.

Prescott "is astonished to find so close a resemblance between the institutions of the American Indian, the ancient Roman, and the modern Catholic." (*Peru*, I, p. 103.)

VESTMENTS.

From the descriptions given by several heathen authors and from the picture tablets in the Museum at Pompeii, we can see what kind of vestments were used in the pagan temple-worship. And we can see that the clothing of the Romish priest, the alb, amict, stole, and maniple, are taken direct from the heathen.

The cowl of the heathen begging monks was used as an aid to deception to impart to the beggar's face an air of child-like simplicity, as Jerome, the Christian, and Apuleius, the heathen novelist, both point out. Twelve centuries later Cardinal Bellarmine wrote: "The cowl sets forth the infantile

simplicity to which the monks desire [pretend] to return." (R. E.³, X, p. 526; VII, p. 552.)

Westropp and Wake, in their "Ancient Symbol Worship," say: "The priestly vestments are like those formerly used in the worship of Saturn and Cybele: the Phrygian cap, the pallium, the stole, and the alb. The whole Pantheon has been exhausted, from the Indus, Euphrates, and the Nile, to supply symbolic adornment for the apostles' successors."

As many pagans loved to be buried in the sacred vestments of their holy priests in order to have a safe passage to heaven, so the papal Romanists. In "Piers the Ploughman," if you only pay money,

"St. Francis himself shall fold thee in his cope,
And present thee to the Trinity, and pray for thy sins."

For the same superstition King John of England was buried in a monk's cowl, and many others also.

THE TONSURE.

In Egypt the priests of Isis and of Serapis shaved their heads. Pachomius, the founder of convents, lived in a temple of Serapis before his conversion. This pagan tonsure was adopted by the monks and nuns of Egypt and Syria, as Jerome writes. It was adopted by the Roman clergy at the end of the fifth century. The catacombs and the mosaics prove that it was unknown in earlier days, though Rome teaches officially that Peter introduced it as a symbol of Christ's crown of thorns and of the royal dignity of the priesthood. (R. E.³, XIX, p. 836. Hislop, p. 323.)

On Lev. 21, 5, William Tyndale comments: "Of the heathen priests, then, our prelates took the example of their bald pates." (Pat. Smyth, p. 99.)

SPITTLE.

John James Blunt, in his "Vestiges of Ancient Manners," says: "In administering the rite of baptism, the priest, among other ceremonies, moistens a napkin with his own saliva, and then touches with it the eyes and nose of the child, accom-

panying the action by the word *Ephphatha*. It was with a similar rite that Roman infants received their names on the *Dies Lustricus*."

Perseus says:—

"Lo! from his little crib the grandam hoar,
Or aunt, well versed in superstitious lore,
Snatches the babe; in lustral spittle dips
Her middle finger, and anoints the lips
And forehead." *Satire*, II, 31.

In his *Natural History* Pliny gives many strange uses to which spittle is put.

THE NIMBUS.

The Brahmins, Buddhists, Slavs, and especially the Greeks and Romans, used the nimbus, as Vergil calls it, to set forth the excellence and dignity of their gods, heroes, and emperors.

This halo was introduced in the fourth century by Christian artists. (R. E.³, VII, p. 559.)

Vergil describes Juno as "nimbo succincta."

THE MONOGRAM.

The *chirho* is found in an inscription of the Egyptian goddess Isis and on Egyptian and Greek coins. (R. E.³, XIII, p. 368.)

The common Egyptian symbol of the god Horus became the monogram of Christ—✠. (Chamberlain, II, p. 29.)

Constantine placed it in his banner, on his helmet, and on the shields of his soldiers.

ORIENTATION.

Theophilus Gale, in his "Court of the Gentiles," says: "Another piece of pagan demonolatry was their ceremony of bowing and worshiping towards the East. For the pagans universally worshiped the sun as their supreme God. . . . And do not Antichrist and his sons exactly follow this pagan ceremony?"

Leo the Great rebukes the Romans for first worshiping Apollo, the rising sun, and then going to church.

INCENSE.

The old heathen cult of Rome used incense to expel evil spirits and to please the good spirits. Many Christians were put to death for refusing to throw even a grain of incense into the fire. Bishop Marcellus of Rome confessed being bribed to do so, he was deposed.

This heathen superstition was introduced into Romanism by Leo I, 440—461; Gregory the Great in 600 gave it binding force in an official manner.

SACRAMENT OF MARRIAGE.

In pagan Rome marriage was a religious sacrament; in papal Rome marriage is a religious sacrament. "The Pontificate in this as in so much else being directly based on old Roman pontifical law and proving itself the last official representative of heathendom." (Chamberlain, *Foundations*, I, p. 164.)

The two crowns, the two rings, and the veil were taken over from paganism.

CANDLES.

Herodotus says the Egyptians first introduced the use of lamps in worship. Rollin writes: "A festival surnamed the Feast of Lights was solemnized at Sais. All persons throughout all Egypt, who did not go to Sais, were obliged to illuminate their windows."

Apuleius speaks of the priests in surplices, with wax-candles in their hands, etc. Before joining battle with Constantine, Licinius offered sacrifices to his gods, "lighting up wax-tapers" before them, hinting strongly he would do so no more unless they gave him victory.

So strikingly was this a part of pagan worship that Lactantius in the fourth century taunts the pagan Romans: "They light up candles to God as if He lived in the dark, . . . offering lamps to the Author and Giver of Light." But in time this pagan Romanism crept into papal Romanism.

Candles were forbidden by the 34th canon of the Synod of Elvira (305 or 306) and by the Code of Theodosius. Vig-

lantius says: "We almost see the ceremonial of the Gentiles introduced into the churches under pretense of religion; piles of candles lighted while the sun is still shining." Cardinal Baronius says: "Many neophytes brought the custom from paganism of lighting wax-candles upon tombs." In 396, Bishop Paulinus of Nola gloried in the use of lights.

Dr. Geikie, in his "Life and Words of Christ," says: "Helios, the sun, was the great object of worship, and so deep-rooted was this idolatry that the early Christian missionaries knew no other way of overthrowing it than by changing it into the name of Elias, and turning the temples into churches dedicated to him."

The Spanish priest Vigilantius, of the fourth century, says: "O ye that would imitate the outward splendor of the heathen illuminations! God has no need of your lights."

The second Council of Nicaea, in 787, sanctioned these wax-candles and lamps before the images of the saints, Mary, and Christ, and there they burn to-day, as they burned in the national temple at Delphi, in the temple of Athene Polias, in that of the Arcadian Pan, etc.

IMAGES.

Numa forbade to the Romans the worship of any image of god, man, or beast; yet 100 years B. C., T. Varro bewailed the prevalent image-worship as degrading and of evil influence.

Though God plainly forbids such worship of images, the Pope plainly commands this heathen superstition. The Creed of Pope Pius IV says: "I most firmly assert that the images of Christ, of the Ever-Virgin Mother of God, and of other saints are to be had and retained, and that due honor and veneration are to be rendered to them." And what, pray, is the due honor and veneration?

St. Thomas Aquinas, the official Doctor of the Church, makes answer as follows: "Since Christ is to be worshiped with the worship of *latreia*, it follows that His image is to be also

adored with the worship of *latreia*." (*Latreia* is the highest kind of worship due only to God Himself.)

When the early Christians attacked the heathen for their worship of images, the heathen pleaded that images are "laymen's books," just as the Romanists do now when attacked by Protestants.

Augustine complains of the many adorers of images. The Council of Elvira forbade images in the churches.

In 726, Emperor Leo, the Isaurian, feeling keenly the reproach of Jew and Saracen that the Christian temples were crowded with images more than at the bloom-time of paganism, and fearing that these images hindered the conversion of those nations, ordered the removal from the churches of all pictures, save those of Christ on the cross. The Ecumenical Council of 754, with 338 bishops, said Satan had intruded this idolatry into Christian worship.

Charles the Great derided papal idolatry to Pope Hadrian I: "A painter makes two pictures of women; none would know which was meant for Venus, which for Mary, unless he signed them. When he has done so, one will be degraded and shunned, the other placed in honor, and ye will worship it."

Bishop Catharinus of Minorca said at the Council of Trent: "It is most detestable that at this time there should be in churches and chapels pictures so lascivious that one may see plainly the most shameful parts of the body, which nature prompts to conceal. These are more fit to excite the carnal desires than the devotion of the most mortified flesh."

Troubled by the Pope's sanction of idolatry, Emperor Ferdinand, in 1564, wrote George Witzel and George Cassander, fervent Catholics, on the subject. Cassander replied: "The worship of images and statues has come to great excess among us, . . . for now ours have come not short of the utmost excess of folly that the heathen fell into, whether in making of images, the adorning them, or in paying supreme worship to them."

A Romanist writes: "It is true that the use of these signs

(images) becomes dangerous. Formerly God was obliged to forbid it to the Jews; the Christians, however, thought they might without risk imitate their predecessors, the heathen. Serenius, Bishop of Marseilles, in order to preserve the new converts from the guilt of idolatry, destroyed the images in his diocese. But St. Gregory, the Pope, ordered them to be restored, considering that pastoral instruction would correct the grossest of popular errors."

The magnificent image of Jupiter Capitolinus in one hand held the thunder, in the other a javelin. He was covered with a purple robe similar to that of the Emperor. This Jupiter, it is said, was turned into St. Peter, and this statue is clothed in full pontifical dress, rich with gold and gems, and presented for the worship of the faithful, who kiss his toe, everybody, from the Pope down, just as the mouth and chin of the bronze Hercules in Agrigentum was worn away by kisses, as Cicero tells us. Angelo's marble statue of Christ in Sopra Minerva, in Rome, had to be protected with metal sheathing, so that the kisses of the people might not wear away the marble. The Virgin in S. Agostino and elsewhere had to be protected in like manner.

Vergil writes:—

The weeping statues did the wars foretell,
And holy sweat from brazen idols fell.

Lucan writes:—

Tears shed by gods, our country's patrons,
And sweat from Lares, told the city's woes.

When, in the consulship of Appius Claudius, Publius Crassus was slain in battle, Apollo's statue at Cumae shed tears for four days. In Rome was a figure of Christ that wept so freely that its face had to be wiped, and a figure of Mary was so tearful that it was called S. Maria del Piantu.

The Juno of the Veii nodded and spoke. Psellus tells us "statues laughed." In 1864, an image of Mary in Ara Coeli rolled her eyes, which brought many worshipers and offerings.

In 1867, an image of Mary winked at a man, and Pope Pius IX at once offered indulgences to all contributing to buy her a crown.

As Hercules left his footprints in the rocks, so the Romans show the footprints of Christ in a stone at the church of "Quo Vadis."

On the death of Germanicus, the Romans were so angry that they stoned the images; and Augustus took revenge on Neptune for the loss of his fleet by refusing to allow Neptune's image to be carried in the procession to the games. It still happens that Catholics punish the images when the saints have not done as was expected.

The image of Hercules at Erythrae healed blindness; the image of Artemis cured cough, etc. Just so the saints to-day.

As in paganism the images were bathed and dressed, so in Romanism. The Duke and Duchess of Montpensier, in September, 1852, presented "the Virgin with a magnificent dress of tissue of gold, with white lace and a silver crown." About the same time the dissolute Queen of Spain gave her dresses and jewels to the "Queen of Heaven."

Paganism gave special veneration to the "achiropoiita," images not made with human hands, as the Palladium, the statue of Pallas at Athens, which came fully finished direct from heaven, and the polished shield, which Minerva in broad daylight sent from heaven to Numa. Romanism gives special veneration to such "achiropoiita," *e. g.*, the face of Christ on the handkerchief of Veronica in St. Peter's; the Madonna at the head of the Scala Santa, near the Lateran; the picture of Abgar.

Even the arrangement of images in rows around the temple, the most highly prized standing alone in the most conspicuous place, has been slavishly copied from paganism. Nay, even the priest, decked in robes apparently after the very pattern of those worn by the priests of ancient Rome, and attended like them, by a boy in white, swings his pot of incense and fills the fane with fumes just as the heathen in Homer's time.

Cassander stated to the German emperor at the Reformation: "This worship exhibited to God through images and statues, even the most prudent of the pagans held to be not sufficiently chaste and suitable to God, but invented by superstitious men," and goes on to argue that if pagans felt this, how much more ought Christians condemn the custom.

SHRINES.

In India the source of the Ganges is a holy place; also Allahabad, where two branches unite; also Benares, where the great god has his favorite earthly home; also Saugor Island, where river and sea meet. Bathing here is an act of merit, a set-off against offenses. The people want to be free from the penalty of sin, not from the love and power of sin.

Seeing the image of the god at Puri, the visitor gets salvation.

At other shrines the blind, the dumb, the lame, the leper, the epileptic are cured from their bodily ailments.

Gaya, in North India, is visited by many to do good to their dead ones, no matter whether dead recently or long ago.

In old Rome people went to the shrine of Ceres for a good harvest; to the shrine of Neptune for a good sea voyage; to the shrine of Pluto to help their friends from hell.

Though Christ told the woman of Samaria at Jacob's well: "The hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet in Jerusalem worship the Father," the Romanists have introduced the heathen superstition of especially holy places and shrines where forgiveness of sins may be obtained.

Augustine, Chrysostom, Gregory of Nyssa, and even Jerome protested against the new thing.

Jerome writes, Epistle 46, that pilgrims went to Palestine from Gaul, Britain, Armenia, Persia, India, Ethiopia, Egypt, Pontus, Cappadocia, Mesopotamia, etc.

After his Gallic victories, Julius Caesar on his knees crawled up the hundred and twenty-four steps to the top of the

Capitoline Hill; just so Charles the Great on his knees crawled up the steps to St. Peter's and received years of indulgence for every step; just so, to get years of indulgence for every step, Luther on his knees crawled up the twenty-eight steps of the Scala Santa, the stairs on which Christ went to Pilate's court, "than which there is no holier place on earth."

On the Capitoline Hill stood the temple of Romulus with the bronze she-wolf, and the people brought their sick children to be cured by touching it. On the same site stands the Church of St. Teodoro, and the people still bring their sick children to be healed by the touch.

Two pagans, who slept in the temple of Saints Cosmas and Damian in Rome had to be informed by the saints themselves that this was not a temple of Castor and Pollux, which it formerly had been.

As at Thyrea the sick were borne to the tomb of Polemocrates, grandson of Esculapius, so the papal people carried their sick to the tombs of the martyrs.

Long ago Horace ridiculed a miracle wholly analogous to that of St. Januarius—periodical trickery, then perpetrated by the priests of Gnatia, near Naples.

As the oracle of Delphi translated the bones of Arcas, son of the nymph Callisto, from Maenala to Mantinea, so angels carried the house of Mary from Nazareth to San Loreto.

In the Sanctuary of Pompeii whosoever hears a mass at the altar of St. Joseph obtains plenary indulgence, and the liberation of a soul from purgatory.

If you view the Holy Coat at Treves, you get an indulgence of seven years, which you may even transfer to a soul in purgatory.

Greek and Roman authors make frequent mention of votive gifts, presents promised the gods for deliverance from danger, etc.

This heathen custom was introduced into popish worship.

When the mail brought the news to Paris of MacMahon's defeated army, wives, sisters, and lovers presented their gifts to Our Lady of Victory, and the church was lined with marble tablets 8×4 with this and similar inscriptions, "Honor to Our Lady for her merciful delivery."

The Greek Madonna and child in S. Agostino in Rome is covered with gold, and gems, and jewelry, the grateful gifts of those who have been cured there.

As the great god of the Hindus is vastly more gracious in his favorite city of Benares than elsewhere, so the Virgin Mary is much more gracious at certain shrines than elsewhere.

In 1846, Our Lady of Salette appeared to Melanie, and priest Berthier took up the matter, and soon a lucrative business sprang up there.

But later Our Lady of Lourdes, near Pau, outstripped her rival of La Salette.

A gentleman connected with the management said, "It is all up with Our Lady of Salette; she of Lourdes has flanked her (*l'a flanquée*)."

MEALS FOR THE DEAD.

The old heathen placed food and drink on the graves of their departed, and also celebrated the day of their death with banquets.

This pagan custom crept into Romanism. Augustine's mother Monica brought bread and unmixed wine to the graves of the saints in Milan, as it had been the custom in Africa. Augustine fought the celebration on the ninth day as a pagan custom. Gluttony, drunkenness, adultery, fights, were indulged in on these occasions. Wild scenes were daily witnessed even in St. Peter's at Rome in the time of Augustine. (N. Mueller, *Koimeterien*, R. E.⁸, 10, 831.)

In Wilkinson's "Egyptians" we read: "The priest induced the people to expend large sums on funeral rites; and many who had barely sufficient to obtain the necessaries of life

were anxious to save something for the expenses of their death. . . . Numerous demands were made upon the estate of the deceased for the celebration of prayer and other services for the soul. The ceremonies consisted of a sacrifice. . . . Incense and libation were also presented; and a prayer was sometimes read. . . . Indeed, they continued to be administered at intervals, as long as the family paid for their performance." Just like the papists.

CHARMS.

In India charms are worn to protect people from snakes and disease; wives wear them to secure children; jealous ones, to retain a husband's love. Rice is placed on a child's tongue for good luck. A drop of water from the sacred Ganges or a grain of consecrated rice is given at death to cleanse the soul from sin and secure a good passage to heaven.

In Thibet the ashes of holy priests are worn as a charm.

Vergil says: "Charms have the power to draw the truant moon from heaven. Circe, by charms, transformed the trusty band of Ulysses. Crushed by the force of charms, the cold snake lies dead in the meadow."

Though the Bible forbids all superstition, this piece of paganism crept into Romanism, especially at the time of Constantine, in the fourth century.

Bingham's "Antiquities" says: "There was one sort of enchantment which many ignorant and superstitious Christians, out of the remains of heathen error, much affected; that was the use of charms and amulets and spells to cure disease, or avert dangers or mischiefs, both from themselves and the fruits of the earth. For Constantine had allowed the heathen, in the beginning of his reformation, for some time, not only to consult the augurs in public, but also to use charms by way of remedy for bodily distempers, and to prevent storms of rain and hail from injuring the ripe fruits, as appears from that very law, where he condemns the other sort of magic that tended to do mischief to be punished with death."

In the fourth century the clergy were forbidden to sell charms, in the eighth century the people were forbidden to wear them; yet their use is almost universal among the papists.

Pope Gregory XIV wore an image of St. Philip Neri which, he believed, had saved his life during an earthquake at Beneventura.

Pope Urban V sent his emperor a charm with the following verses:—

Thunder it chases,
Sin it effaces,
From fire it saves
And flood when it raves.
Sudden death shuns it,
Devils revere it,
Enemies fear it, etc.

Charles V died with a candle from the shrine of Our Lady at Montserrat in his hand and with the picture of Our Lady at the head of the bed.

At the Battle of Sedgmoor the Duke of Monmouth was protected by a charm around his neck. When the French Prince Imperial fell pierced by a Zulu spear, he was wearing a medal of the Virgin. This the Zulus feared to touch, for fear the charm might transfer the owner's bad luck to them.

The Spanish bull-fighters usually wear charms, and it is not uncommon to find a silver heart of the Virgin round the necks of Italian banditti.

Pope Pius X permitted the Catholic society ladies who wear the fashionable low-necked dresses to wear their charms elsewhere than around their necks.

The consecrated host has been used as a love charm by a neglected wife, to render bees fruitful, to drive away caterpillars, as a cure for blindness. Amaliri of Metz says when a wicked man was to be buried, the earth refused to receive his body. St. Benedict gave a wafer to place on the corpse, and the trouble was all over. (Joh. Ficker, *Amulett*, R. E.³, I, 467—476.)

CELIBACY.

When the worship of Cybele, the Babylonian goddess, was introduced into pagan Rome, it came with its celibate priesthood. Several of the Roman orders vowed celibacy, the Vestals also chastity.

Though the Bible calls forbidding to marry the "doctrine of devils," papal Rome forced the celibacy of pagan Rome on her priests.

About 180, Bishop Dionysius of Corinth begged a colleague "not to depart from Gospel teaching" by trying to enforce celibacy. In 325, Spanish bishops wished to enforce priestly celibacy at Nicaea, but the unwed Paphnutius opposed it, and it was rejected by a large majority. But Pope Siricius enforced clerical celibacy because "to please God" was a clerical obligation. Gregory VII did likewise, for "the Church cannot be independent of lay influence unless priests be without wives."

The history of Thibet, China, and Japan, where priestly celibacy prevailed, testifies to the abominations that flowed from the system. The excesses of the celibate priests of Bacchus compelled the pagan Roman Senate to expel them from the republic. (Livy, Bk. 39, ch. 8. 18.)

When Paul V intended to suppress the licensed brothels of the Holy City, the papal Roman Senate opposed it on the ground that they were the only means of hindering the priests from seducing their wives and daughters. So says the Catholic historian De Thou. (Hislop, p. 322.)

In 1836, the births in Rome numbered 4373; 3160 were foundlings. (Seymour's *Evenings with Romanists*.)

As late as 1840 Gregory XVI was petitioned to abrogate the law against celibacy. But the Pope refused, slurring wedlock as "foedissimus."

Pope Pius II thought that though good reasons had been found for introducing celibacy, better ones might be found for ending it.

Milwaukee, Wis.

W. DALLMANN.

(To be concluded.)

THE PROOF TEXTS OF THE CATECHISM WITH A PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.

THE SECOND ARTICLE.

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

Rom. 1, 4: *Jesus Christ, our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead.*

"Spirit of holiness," *πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης*, is a rare expression in the New Testament. Does it here designate the third person of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit? No. "Holy Spirit" would be expressed by *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*. Studiously, as it were, the apostle avoids this latter expression, and uses the designation "spirit of holiness," to indicate that it is not to be understood of the Holy Spirit. — What, then, does "spirit of holiness" mean? Let us observe the text! "Christ was made of the seed of David *according to the flesh*," *κατὰ σάρκα*. "According to the flesh" obviously means: according to His human nature. Christ was a descendant of David, and as such true man. But this same Christ also possessed a higher nature, a divine nature. This is expressed by *κατὰ πνεῦμα*, *according to the spirit*, according to His divine nature. (Cf. 1 Pet. 3, 18.) Since "according to the spirit" is in antithesis to "according to the flesh," and "according to the flesh" means His *human nature*, "according to the spirit" can designate nothing else than His *divine nature*. This the antithesis demands. *Πνεῦμα* is *nomen essentie*. John 4, 24; 2 Cor. 3, 17. Jesus Christ is true man and true God, the Son of God. — This divine nature is *πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης*, *spirit of holiness*; i. e., it is absolutely holy. And this holy divine nature of the Son of God permeates, fills, as it were, the human nature of the Son of David.

Now, says Paul, this Person, Jesus Christ, who was not only true man, a seed of David, but also true God, was *declared*, marked off, determined, to be such — God, Son of God. How?

"By the resurrection from the dead." The incontrovertible fact of His resurrection proves His divine Sonship beyond the shadow of a doubt. The studious change of the language should be noted: Christ was *made* of the seed of David, but He was *not* made, but only declared *to be* the Son of God. (See John 1, 1. 14.) — Christ was the Son of God before the foundation of the world, Col. 1, 15. In the state of humiliation He proved Himself to be the Son of God by His many miracles. Nowhere else, however, have we such conclusive evidence of His being what He claimed to be — Son of God — as in His resurrection from the dead. — The emphatic statement: "He was declared to be the *Son of God in power*" = υἱὸς θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει, i. e., the powerful, the almighty, the majestic Son of God, moreover, adds an important thought. In the state of humiliation Christ always was the mighty God, but He did not always appear as such; He did not always use His divine majesty and power, communicated to His human nature by virtue of the personal union; now, however, by and since His resurrection, He is declared to be Son of God *in power*; now, in the state of exaltation, He fully and constantly uses the divine majesty communicated to His human nature also according to this His human nature.

John 2, 19: *Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.*

One day the Jews demanded a special sign of Christ as a proof for His Messiahship. "*Destroy this temple,*" said He, meaning *His body*, v. 21, "*and in three days I will raise it up.*" What a stupendous assertion to make! For ages and ages generations had come and gone, but from the grave not a single person had returned. And here stands this man Jesus before the Jews and says: "You will kill me, but I shall return from the grave, and I shall rise by my own power. I am the Conqueror of death." What happens? He was crucified, dead, and buried, but on the third day, according to His prediction, He rose again. He spoke truly when He

said: I will raise my body up; He spoke truly when He said on another occasion: "I have power to lay it (my life) down, and I have power to take it again," John 10, 18. None but God is the lord over death. Christ conquered death. He rose of *His own power*; Christ is God. —

But there is another truth in this passage pertinent to the matter in hand. The words, John 2, 19, are a prophecy. Christ prophesied His *death*: "Destroy this temple, my body." He foreknew what the Jews would do with His body: they would "destroy it" — kill Him; and He plainly tells them so. He prophesied concerning His *resurrection*: "In three days I will raise it up." Both prophecies came true. Christ is a true prophet; His doctrine is the truth. — The resurrection of Christ provides us with a solid foundation for our faith in the divinity of Christ, and gives us absolute assurance of the reliability of His doctrine.

1 Cor. 15, 17: *If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished.*

The resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead is the corner-stone of our Christian faith. Disprove it, and the Christian religion collapses. Sad, beyond expression sad, were our lot if Christ were not risen. St. Paul draws this gloomy picture: 1. "If Christ be not raised, *vain is your faith.*" *Vain*, *paraía*, is put in an emphatic position. *paraía* = vain, fruitless, hence without power and effect, futile. "Vain is your faith;" your faith has no ground on which to stand, no truth on which to rely. 2. "*Ye are yet in your sins.*" If Christ is not risen, reconciliation with God is not effected, His wrath abideth on you, you have no forgiveness of sin, you are not redeemed. 3. "*Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished.*" These deceased Christians died in the faith of Christ as their Savior; they believed their death to be but a sleep after which there would be a joyful awakening — but lo! if Christ be not raised, they were

deluded—they died without expiation of their sins and are accordingly lost, damned. Aye, indeed, “if in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable. But,” the apostle proceeds, “now is Christ risen from the dead.” Hence it follows: 1. that our faith is not vain, not groundless, but rests upon a firm foundation; 2. that our sins are atoned for; 3. that when we fall asleep in Christ, we, too, shall rise and live with Him eternally.—Christ’s resurrection is proof positive for the completeness and the sufficiency of our redemption, and it gives us full assurance of the truth of His doctrine.

Rom. 4, 25: *Who (Christ) was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification.*

Christ was our Substitute. This well-known truth of Scriptures is obvious in our text also, if we but observe the pronouns “who—our.” The Just takes the place of the unjust, and the Just, Christ, “was delivered,” was given up, *viz.*, to death, *δὲ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν*, on account of our trespasses. The Just died for the unjust in order to expiate their trespasses. God delivered Him into death on account of our sins. Rom. 8, 32; Gal. 1, 3. And willingly “Christ gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity,” Tit. 2, 14. On the cross at Calvary our Substitute expired with the words on His lips: “It is finished.” Atonement for our sins was made. But the anxious question remained, “Will God accept this atonement?” A dead Savior can avail us nothing. Where is the proof that God is satisfied with the work of His Son? Triumphant Christ rises from the grave on the third day. “*He was raised for our justification.*” Here is proof, positive proof, that His death had been accepted as an expiation for our sins. In order to justify us, God raised Christ from the dead. We look to Calvary and we know: “Christ was delivered for our offenses.” We look into the empty grave of Christ and are assured: “He was raised for our justification.” God the Father has accepted the sacrifice of His Son for the reconciliation of the world.

John 14, 19: "*Because I live, ye shall live also.*"

John 11, 25. 26: *I am the Resurrection and the Life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.*

In a little Christian family, in the small village at Bethany, there is deep sorrow. Martha and Mary mourn over the death of their brother Lazarus. Jesus comes that way, and in the course of the conversation He consoles Martha by saying: "Thy brother shall rise again." Martha believes that. She says: "I know he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." Then Jesus utters the mighty words of our text. In the fullness of emphasis he says: "*I am*" — *Ἐγώ εἰμι* — "*the Resurrection,*" and hence the whole power to effect it is mine. In me the resurrection is absolutely certain. I am "*the Life.*" I have immortality, imperishable, unchanging life, in myself (John 1, 4), and can impart it to others, so that they need not and cannot die. "*He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live.*" Belief in me, faith in me, so intimately unites the believer with me that as certainly as I live the believer shall also live. — John 14, 19: "*Because I live, ye shall live also.*" True, the Christians, too, must die. But in the light of Scripture, what is temporal death for the Christians? A sleep. Says Paul: "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so *them* also *which sleep in Jesus* will God bring with Him," 1 Thess. 4, 14. And Jesus says: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, If a man keep my saying, *he shall never see death,*" John 8, 51. The bitterness of death the Christian will not taste. Death to him is but a sleep after which there is a blissful awakening. Death has been swallowed up of life. Temporal death of Christians is so little to be looked upon as death that Christ says: "*And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.*" Temporal death to the Christians is but an entrance to eternal life. — Thus the resurrection of Christ from the dead makes us absolutely certain of a blessed life beyond the grave.

CHRIST'S ASCENSION.

Ps. 68, 18: *Thou hast ascended on high, Thou hast led captivity captive; Thou hast received gifts for men, yea, for the rebellious also.*

Forty days after His resurrection, Christ ascended into heaven visibly, according to His human nature, as narrated in the Gospels and the Acts. In the night when He was betrayed, He said to His disciples: "In my Father's house are many mansions. . . . I go to prepare a place for you," John 14, 3. Christ ascended into heaven for us, for our benefit. Hence this doctrine, too, is full of strong consolation for His servants. — This His ascension was foretold in the Old Testament. Ps. 68 is a Messianic psalm. Paul quotes it Eph. 4, 8 as speaking of Christ. Christ is the Lord Jehovah extolled in the psalm. After a long and fierce warfare with His enemies, Christ remains the Victor. His and our enemies have been overcome. The work of redemption being completed, He "*ascended on high*," i. e., into heaven. He despoiled principalities and powers, Col. 2, 15; He "*led captivity captive*," He "*led away captives*" (S. A. V.), i. e., Satan and all his hellish cohorts, making a show of them openly in a triumphal procession. Our enemies are vanquished. Not only that. This exalted Christ who ascended into heaven has not only "*led away captives*," but He also "received gifts for men," or rather, He "received gifts among men," that is to say, the "men" are the gifts, "men" he has received; men, who are now His own, believe in Him and serve Him. He "received gifts among men so that rebellious also dwell with the Lord God." (Stoeckhardt.) The Standard American Version translates thus, the sense remaining essentially the same as the one here given: "Thou hast received gifts among men, yea, among the rebellious also, that Jehovah God might dwell with them." *Rebellious*, too, i. e., men who at one time opposed the Lord, turn to the Lord, lay down their rebel arms, and by His grace live with Him in His kingdom. To such rebellious people whom the Lord draws to Himself belong the heathen, such as

the Ethiopians and the Egyptians, of whom the psalm speaks. (Cf. Stoeckhardt, *Epheserbrief*, p. 190.)

Eph. 4, 10: *He that descended is the same also that ascended far above all heavens, that He might fill all things.*

St. Paul, quoting Ps. 68, 18, goes on to say: "Now that He ascended, what is it but that He also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?" Then follows our text. "*He that descended,*" the very same, just He, and no one else, He precisely, "*is the same also that ascended.*" His ascent corresponds to His descent. "*He that descended*" — whither did He descend? "Into the lower parts of the earth," says v. 9. This is a fitting description of His *descensio ad inferos*. (Cf. 1 Pet. 3, 19.) As Victor He descended into hell. Having descended into the *utmost depth*, He, after a brief sojourn here on earth, ascended to the *utmost height*; He "*ascended far above all heavens,*" above all created heavens, to sit at the right hand of God the Father, Eph. 1, 20. The purpose of His ascension the apostle expresses thus: "*that He might fill all things.*" After His exaltation and ascension Christ fills "all things" with His efficacious presence, also according to His glorified human nature, and from this omnipresence flows His special gracious presence with His Church, as the apostle shows further on.

John 12, 26: *Where I am, there shall also my servant be.*

Speaking of His approaching death, Jesus had said: "The hour" decreed in the eternal counsel "is come that the Son of Man should be glorified." By His passion and death, through which He must pass, He was to enter into the glory of the Father. Pursuing this thought, He thinks of His own. "*Where I am*" in this my kingdom, "*there shall also my servant be.*" Christ and His servants shall be together always. He has ascended to prepare a place for us.

Springfield, Ill.

LOUIS WESSEL.

(To be continued.)

BOOK REVIEW.

Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., announces the following publications:—

1. *DR. CONRAD DIETERICH'S INSTITUTIONES CATECHETICAE*, das ist, gruendliche Auslegung des Katechismus Dr. Martin Luthers in Frage und Antwort und mit Anmerkungen versehen. Aus dem Lateinischen uebersetzt von Dr. F. W. A. Notz. Second revised and enlarged edition. 526 pages. \$2.00.

Dieterich's *Catechetical Institutes* was first given to the Lutheran Church in the German language thirty-six years ago. But the Latin original had been a trusted and oft-employed source of information to our catechists and preachers of catechetical sermons two generations ago. A pastor's library did not seem complete without this book. For practical, not for doctrinal reasons (see THEOL. QUART., vol. X, p. 129 ff.), the Missouri Synod has substituted a simpler catechism for Dieterich's, which was formerly used exclusively throughout the Synod. This change has, no doubt, reduced the use of the *Institutes* by our pastors and teachers. Moreover, Mezger's *Entwuerfe* have supplied the wants of the Missouri catechist in a more direct and practical way. We do not consider it likely that the *Institutes* will recover the ground that has been lost because of the events noted before. Still we would speak a word of earnest commendation for the *Institutes*. Their depth and breadth of treatment, their calm, firm, and withal cheering presentation of the catechetical material, and their wealth of references to the literature of the Church *pro* and *con* of any controverted subject up to the age of Dieterich († March 22, 1639) is such that a painstaking, digestive study of this book will prepare a Lutheran catechist for life on any topic of the catechism of the Lutheran Church. The *Institutes* require study, severe study. They do not make catechising easy by offering ready outlines, but they stock the mind of the catechist with sound knowledge, and render him resourceful, independent and self-reliant. The task of mastering the *Institutes* has been amply repaid to hundreds of our brethren who have undertaken it. It has increased their theological solidity and compactness, and rendered their work in other pastoral pursuits easier.

2. A doctrinal paper showing "*That the Bible is God's Word, and being such, should be diligently used;*" read before the Oregon and Washington District of the Missouri Synod by Rev. J. A. Rimbach. 85 pages. 12 cts.

3. A doctrinal paper on "Interest in the Church," read before the Nebraska District of the Missouri Synod by *Rev. H. Schabacker*. 35 pages. 15 cts.

4. *PROCEEDINGS OF THE TWELFTH CONVENTION* of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri and other States. A. D. 1911. 80 pages. 15 cts.

This is the Report of the last convention of the English Missouri Synod, and contains a doctrinal paper by *Rev. M. Sommer* on the Unity of the Christian Church (also published separately in pamphlet form, for 10 cts.) and a full account of the union of this Synod with the German Missouri Synod which was effected at this convention. Thus on a notable occasion in the history of our Church the truth set forth by the essayist of our English brethren at their last convention was given a happy emphasis by the brethren's action.

5. *VERHANDLUNGEN* der Deutschen Ev.-Luth. Synode von Missouri, Ohio u. a. St., versammelt als *Dreizehnte Delegatensynode* 1911. 212 pages. 45 cts.

This volume gives evidence of the strenuous days from May 10 to 20, when 631 delegates dispatched the ordinary and extraordinary business which accumulates within the Missouri Synod in the space of three years.

6. *AMERIKANISCHER KALENDER* fuer deutsche Lutheraner auf das Jahr 1912. 96 pages. 10 cts.

Appears for the first time in the handy size of its English companion. The names of the pastors and teachers of the former English Synod are merged in the German list of addresses, and in the geographical list the synodical affiliation of ministers is indicated.

7. *LUTHERAN ANNUAL* 1912. 96 pages. 10 cts.

The English Almanac of the Missouri Synod has come to stay, and with this issue, its third, has increased its reading matter to the size of the German almanac. In the Calendar part the columns for receipts and disbursements have been displaced by the customary astronomical tables, probably because the owner will derive more satisfaction from these. The remainder of the contents is a duplicate of those of the German almanac.

8. *KONJUGATIONSTABELLEN*. Von *August Crull*. 8 pages. 3 cts. Special prices in quantities.

These tables, reprinted from the author's *Lehrbuch der deutschen Sprache*, contain the three main auxiliary verbs and one paradigm

each for the strong and the weak conjugation of German verbs. Their usefulness for teachers of German is manifest.

9. *JUSTIFICATION*. An Essay read before Augustana E. L. Conference and published by its order. Second edition. 60 pages. 10 cts.

This is a mere reprint of a publication that appeared fifteen years ago. It would have been revised in places as regards orthography and style, had the author known that a second edition was being prepared.

10. *MEMORIAL SKETCH* of Dr. C. F. W. Walther. For the Children of our Schools. 16 pages. 5 cts.

This excellent rendition of Wegener's German pamphlet has done good service during our late centennial celebration of the birth of Dr. Walther.

11. *OUR CHURCH*. A Program for the Festival of the Reformation. To be rendered in a Children's Service. 16 pages. 5 cts.

We regret to have to announce this meritorious publication *post festum*. It differs from previous publications of its kind in the catechetical portions. These are not given in the form of ready-made questions and answers, but their place is merely indicated in the program, and a connected historical account is given at the end, which teachers and pupils are to study, and from which each is to prepare his own questions or answers.

12. *DER HEILAND, MEIN ERLOESER*. Weihnachtsliturgie. Katechese fuer den Christabend. Dargeboten von W. C. Rein. 15 pages. 5 cts.

13. *CONCORDIA SUNDAY-SCHOOL CLASS BOOK*. 6 cts.

Contains space for 24 pupils for one, or for 12 pupils for two years.

14. *CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE: KATALOG 1911—1912*. 408 pages. Gratis on application.

This bulky book-list evidences the healthy growth of our synodical book concern. It has grown since last year by 24 pages. The additions are largely in the department of foreign publication. — In the list of home publications we notice, with regret, that Walther's edition of Baier's Compend has disappeared. This work deserves republication in an up-to-date edition as regards the antitheses.

15. *CONCORDIA BIBLE CLASS. — CONCORDIA-BIBEL-KLASSE.* Vol. I, No. 1, January, 1912. 18 pages. Published monthly. Each 40 cts. per annum.

This publication represents the culmination of the system of Sunday-school lessons issued by our Concordia Press since a year ago. The system leads up to the direct and immediate study of the Bible. In the last grade of this system the Bible itself becomes the text-book, and the lesson help, more than at any previous stage, recedes to the background to assume the function of an experienced guide in a wonderful landscape, or art gallery, or machine shop, who whispers his directions into your ear, telling you where to look and what to observe, but allowing the panorama before you to silently work its effect upon the mind. This feature is strongly and deservedly emphasized by the author of *Concordia Bible Class*, Prof. Mezger, who insists that each section in this monthly should be read by the pupil in his own Bible, and that the Lesson should be studied only after this duty has been conscientiously performed. The character of the material offered in these Lessons is such as not to draw attention away from the Bible itself, but to actually open up to view the striking contents of the Word, thus aiding in the fulfillment of the ancient prayer of ardent Bible-students: "Open Thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy Law!" A double device has been adopted for achieving this effect: first, the Bible text which forms the lesson is printed in italics, with brief paraphrastic remarks intercalated in ordinary type, after the fashion of the *Weimar Bibel*; secondly, illuminating notes, containing geographical, historical, archaeological, but chiefly doctrinal explanations, and occasionally illustrations, are given at the foot of the page. Both the paraphrases and the annotations are clear, simple, and pointed, and their scope is entirely practical. The German original has been very acceptably reproduced in the English translation. It is a modest and unpretentious publication that is here offered, but it possesses high merit, and the valuable service which it is qualified to render to our young and old Bible students—may their tribe increase!—can easily be made permanent by having the monthly numbers of *Bible Class* bound whenever a book of the Bible has been completed. For the present the Gospel according to St. Matthew will be treated.—*Bible Class* breaks away from the concentric system which prevails in the inferior departments. The Editorial Committee explains the reasons for this change in the Introductory Remarks. They are quite satisfactory. Highly as we, too, value the sequence of the times and seasons of the ecclesiastical year and of the pericopal system, we value a full, comprehensive,

and connected study of the Bible more, and we consider the sacrifice of the concentric idea really paltry in comparison with the greater results which may justly be expected from this mode of studying the Bible. After all, what are all lessons and helps and aids but efforts to introduce the Bible to the pupil? They lead, logically, pedagogically, theologically, to just such an effort as *Bible Class* represents. It is a glorious termination for any system if it takes its pupils directly to the Bible as its goal.

FOLLOW JESUS. By *William Dallmann*. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House. 1911. 297 pages. \$1.00. Also to be had at Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

THE CONTAGION OF CHARACTER. Studies in Culture and Success. By *Newell Dwight Hillis*. Fleming H. Revell Co. 332 pages. \$1.20 net.

By the collocation of these two books, which happened to be sent us at the same time, there is no *ἐτεροζυγισμὸς* indicated. They are merely a study in contrasts.

Rev. Dallmann's book is a Christian treatise on Christian ethics, written by a Christian for Christians. The non-Christian will have no use for this book, except as a literary product of no small merit. To the non-Christian, to the *ἄνθρωπος ψυχικός*, its spirited chapters, and terse paragraphs, and crisp sentences will be a vast conundrum; for he does not understand either the why or the wherefore of the appeals with which this book is ringing on every page. Yea, were he to imagine this book written for him, it would prove poison to him. But this book is manna for the *ἄνθρωπος πνευματικός*. — On the solid basis of that work which divine grace has accomplished in the sinner in the hour of his conversion, the author raises an abode of holiness, the dwelling-place during his earthly sojourn of the child of God. It is the mansion of the just man still imperfect. Its chambers are resplendent with the chaste beauty of the holy Christ; it is His voice that is heard everywhere in this house: "If ye love me, keep my commandments." No one can read this book without being impressed with the perception what a real, what an earnest thing Christianity is. Christianity has its contemplative side. The Christian is a searcher in the volume of the Book. He seeks to fill his mind with the facts of revelation. He meditates on the Law day and night. He digests what apostles and prophets have uttered. He revolves in his mind, weighs and ponders what is said concerning

the Son of God, and what the Son of God has spoken. In a word, the Christian wants to know, and know still better what he has known at first. But his pensive reveries are only one phase of his state of grace. The Christian also speaks, and witnesses, of the things which he knows. He maintains his ground against gainsayers. Believing, he cannot but speak and publish his God-wrought convictions. That is another phase of his state of grace. But the test of all his meditations and declarations, the indispensable complement of all his professions, is in his practice. "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them;" "Be ye doers of the Word, and not hearers only,"—on this ultimate consequence of consistent Christian faith Rev. Dallmann's book insists with fervent zeal. It is a Pentecostal treatise on the foundation of the Easter evangel. — We have heard of the "propaganda of the deed." Skillful dialectics employed for the defense of the Christian religion are good as far as they go. Nor does the Christian apologist disdain all use of the power of oratory. He may speak with the tongue of men and angels. But he is sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal without that approbation which a truly Christlike conduct must and will wring from an unwilling world. The finest system of Christian apologetics, the most effective form which Christian missionary effort can assume, is Christian living and Christian dying. "Strengthened with all might, according to His glorious power," the Christian approaches his daily tasks in the Master's service, and convicts, or convinces his observers that it is good to be what he has become through Him who loved him and gave Himself for him. — We heartily commend Rev. Dallmann's book. We think that it is the best that he has written.

We have grouped our Milwaukee brother with the well-known New York divine. His book, too, treats of character. It is most ably written, of high literary excellency, abounding in apt illustrations which lead to ingenious applications. The entire book is pitched in a highly optimistic key, though it discusses the follies and the vices of the men of our day. There are glimpses in this book of the Christ, but they are not frequent nor distinct. It is a dim and distant Christ whose presence is vaguely felt in the author's brief sketches. Christ is not the prominent, conspicuous, ever present reality in the lives of the saints that the Epistles represent Him as being. Moreover, the full extent of human depravity, the universality and totality of connate corruption in man, is not recognized in these talks on virtuous living. They are sparkling with wit, full of dazzling contrasts, buoyant with hope, but one does not receive the impression that its lessons are inculcated on account of Christ, that the wise counsels which they offer are offered through Christ, with

Christ, for Christ. They will train a cultured rationalist rather than an obedient disciple of Jesus. The Christian will accept nearly all these lessons, but practice them for more exalted reasons.

DOGMATIK von A. Hoenecke. 10. Lieferung. Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, Wis. 80 pages. 40 cts.

Dr. Hoenecke's *Dogmatik* has now progressed as far as the chapter on Soteriology. The present number completes the treatise on the Call of Grace, Illumination, Regeneration, Conversion, Repentance (incomplete). One third of this number is devoted to Conversion. The author exhibits the views of the older Lutheran dogmaticians on this subject, and adds his critical remarks. Modern Synergistic error in this department of dogmatics is also briefly sketched and refuted.

Johannes Herrmann of Zwickau, Saxony, announces the following publications, which may be ordered from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo:—

1. Jul. Schnorr von Carolsfeld, *Das Leben unseres Heilandes*. 23 woodcuts with appropriate Bible texts. 10 cts.

2. Olga Burckhardt, *9 Christmas Postal Cards* with poetry. 20 cts.

3. Marg. Lenk, *Weihnachtsfeier*. 5 cts.—A pretty little tale for children.

4. Valerius Herberger, *Merkblatt fuer Taufpaten* und alle, die einer Taufhandlung beiwohnen oder sonst ihrer heiligen Taufe gedenken. 16 pages. 3 cts.—Valuable for sponsors at baptism.

5. O. Willkomm, *Was will aus dem Kindlein werden?* 32 pages. 10 cts.—An excellent tract for parents blessed with children.

6. O. Willkomm, *Licht von Oben*. Second Edition. 32 pages. 10 cts.—A tract full of wise counsel and strong comfort in the ills and sorrows of this present life.

7. *Der evangelisch-lutherische Hausfreund-Kalender 1912*. 28th year. 109 pages. 15 cts.

This well-known favorite in our circles opens up with a searching meditation on the confessional lukewarmness of Christians. The remainder of the reading matter is of the same high order as in former years.

8. *Dr. Martin Luthers Grosser Katechismus*. With Luther's portrait. 144 pages. 15 cts.

It was a capital thought to edit the Larger Catechism of Luther in this handy and attractive form. An actual literary want has thus been filled in a creditable manner.

9. *Lutherhefte*. Vorboten zum Reformations-Jubilaum 1917. No. 4: *Luthers Vorrede zum Roemerbrief*; No. 5—6: *Von der Freiheit eines Christenmenschen*; No. 7: *Vom Geheimnis der heiligen Dreieinigkeit*; No. 8: *Von Christi Person*; No. 9: *Vom Heiligen Geist*; No. 20: *Lutherworte ueber Mission*. 5 cts. a copy. Special prices in quantities.

These little tracts of sixteen pages each are reprints of the best things that Luther wrote. Such literature widely scattered would be the very best and effective effort to extend the faith for which Luther strove. The pamphlets will be gladly read by our laymen. The successive issues are consecutively numbered, so as to admit of ten issues being bound into one volume.

10. C. F. W. Walther, *Die Stimme unserer Kirche in der Frage von Kirche und Amt*. Jubilaums-Ausgabe. 448 pages. \$1.25. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This book has had a formative influence on the American Lutheran Church. It was sixty years old last June. At the time of its publication in Germany the Missouri Synod was a mere infant. When this book appeared, Lutheranism was inclined to consider the Missouri Synod the *enfant terrible* in the Lutheran family of the world. This book published, with childlike *naïveté*, things which leading Lutherans of the time treated as family secrets, buried a long time ago never to be resuscitated. It showed that the Lutherans of its day were misrepresenting the faith of the Lutheran Church on such vital and fundamental questions as these: What is the Church? and: Who are the people on this earth that are vested by Christ, primarily and directly, with all spiritual rights and privileges? There were Romanizing tendencies in the Lutheran Church of those days. This book brought about a *denouement* of the leading spirits in the Lutheran Church. The ill-informed Lutheranism of the day was paralleled with the well-informed Lutheranism of Luther, the Book of Concord, and the orthodox teachers of the Lutheran Church down to Hollaz. It was a bitter truth, though Walther administered it lovingly. But it was necessary that just this truth was told at the time. It checked the Lutheran Church in its downward career, sent it back along the old confessional, Scriptural paths, and therewith inaugurated a new advance of confessional Lutheranism, at least in America. We have not the least desire to depreciate one iota the noble labors of American Lutherans who had toiled for the upbuilding of our Church in this country prior to Walther. We own every loyal son of our Church just as much as others who may claim a more direct relationship with them. But it simply was not given them

to speak the old truths in such a clear, courageous, and convincing manner, and at such a critical moment in the history of our Church as it was given to Walther. It was not absolutely necessary that Walther should be the man to speak these truths. Had he not spoken, God could have employed another. As it is, his book became the instrument and the occasion for a mighty and beneficial commotion in the American Lutheran Church. It brought on one of the decisive battles of Lutheranism. American Lutheran history would read entirely different to-day, had this book not appeared.

Walther felt the incongruity of the situation that wrested this book from him. He says in his "Introductory Remarks" to the first edition that it is odd that he should raise his feeble voice from the American backwoods on matters which could be far more ably and exhaustively treated by men who had access to the European libraries, and were in the closest touch with the literary geniuses of the age. Walther blushed to tell highly renowned men of his Church that the defects which they assumed in the teaching of the Lutheran Church regarding the Church and the ministry, were imaginary, fictitious; that the Lutheran Church had spoken her Bible mind on these topics with unequivocal precision and finality, from the day that it had started out to be a church. Walther felt uncomfortable having to prove to Lutherans that, as between them and himself, he was the Lutheran.

It is a spiritual delight now to look down the vista of six decades of intense Lutheran church-life, and observe the purifying, sobering, reconstructive effects which this book, "*Kirche und Amt*," has had. From an apology, as first intended, it grew into an unanswerable charge. Its immediate purpose was to vindicate a few preachers of the Missouri Synod who had been misrepresented by a few preachers of the Buffalo Synod. Its ultimate achievement was to introduce to the Lutheran Church a dear stranger—her own, real self. It was denounced as a destructive book, and it proved the most constructive publication put forth by an American Lutheran of the nineteenth century. For this book roused the Lutheran congregational consciousness, and opened the eyes of the Lutheran clergy to its true dignity and responsibility. The intelligent cooperation of Lutheran clergymen and laymen in their common cause, and, ulteriorly, the astonishing growth and progress of the American Lutheran Church during the last half of the nineteenth century, begin with this book. And this is no mere coincidence.

This book is sixty years old, its truths are as many hundreds of years old,—or shall we rather say, young? For books like these never grow old. The Church can never grow away from them, and

live. "Kirche und Amt" has a perpetual message. Its republication is not so much a compliment to past greatness as a service to present needs and a promise of successes still to come. All the lovers of our Lutheran Zion welcome this thoughtful souvenir of the Walther-year in our Church, and join in a vote of thanks to Mr. Herrmann for having made this latest, the fifth, edition of "Kirche und Amt" also in its external appearance a worthy commemorative volume.

THE BOOK OF CONCORD; or, The Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Translated from the Original Languages, with Analyses and an Exhaustive Index. Edited by *Henry Eyster Jacobs*, D. D., LL. D., S. T. D. Philadelphia: General Council Publication Board. 1911. 758 pages. \$1.50. Also to be had at Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

The "People's Edition" of the Book of Concord is, without question, the sensation of the American Lutheran book-market for 1911. The General Council, with the publication of this book, scores a distinct triumph. It has gladdened the heart of every lover of our English Lutheran Zion. We may say that there never was a time when it was made so easy and so pleasant for the English-speaking members of our Church to be well-informed and conscious Lutherans as since the publication of this astonishingly cheap and yet well-printed and tastefully bound English *Concordia*. The book is not a mere reprint from the two-volume edition of Dr. Jacobs. While this edition is, indeed, followed in the main, and even its plates have been used for the press-work, still the People's *Concordia* contains the Joint Committee's translation of the Augsburg Confession, and in the other confessions the editor has inserted emendations that were suggested to him by critics of his larger work and during his labors through twenty-nine years in the study and class-room.

It might seem natural, in one view, that the General Council, which has for several generations labored in the English field, should be the first to issue an English edition of the confessional writings of our Church. But this does not detract from the merit of the publication. We rejoice all the more because this publication hails from an English body, and because it comes from the General Council. It is an undertaking big with promise. We wish this book a hearty Godspeed, and cordially endorse the following sentiments in the Preface:

Upon the basis of all these Confessions the foundations of the Lutheran Church in America were laid. They were included not only in the Constitutions of many of the earlier congregations, but also in the

first Constitution of the Mother Synod. With the entrance of a period when the importance of this confessional position was not recognized, there came into our history retarding and disorganizing forces that threatened the very existence of our Church as it became anglicized, and that to the present day have greatly divided and confused it.

With a widespread and all but general return towards the confessional position of the Fathers, a period of new life and promise for our Church in America has begun. Upon the hearty acceptance of these Confessions in their historical sense, and their consistent application in the spirit of the Gospel to practice, the General Council, in common with others, offers a basis for the union of the entire Lutheran Church in America. The work in which she has so successfully cooperated in the preparation of a Common Service will not be complete until the agreement possible in such joint work is traced to a more thorough harmony in the faith than had been supposed, and its ultimate expression in agreement as to the terms of confessional statement.

But for the attainment of such end the Confessions must be readily accessible in the common language of the country, and should be found in the studies of all our pastors and in the homes and libraries of all our intelligent people. Even although our Church has never asked its laymen to subscribe to more than the Catechism, yet the importance of their acquaintance with all that, as members of Lutheran synods, they require their pastors to know and teach cannot be questioned.

The popular edition, here offered, fulfills the hope of the editor from the very beginning to have the Confessions published at such price that they may be scattered broadcast throughout all English-speaking lands, where there are confessors of the Lutheran faith — for Canada and Australia, for South Africa and India, for the West Indies and South America, as well as for the United States of America. Such edition will serve an important office in deepening and strengthening the faith of our people in drawing them together in the bonds of a common fellowship, and in enabling them to appreciate all the more highly their heritage. But beyond this, as the preceding edition was warmly welcomed by eminent representatives of other denominations because of much that they found in it encouraging them in their conflicts, so this edition will continue to a much wider circle than the Lutheran Church the testimony which our Fathers gave, and, while in many other religious bodies confessional lines have vanished and confessional obligations weakened, a standard is here raised around which millions in this Western world will rally. The attentive reader, whatever may be his antecedents, will see that the matters here treated are not antiquated or obsolescent, but enter most deeply into the issues of the hour.

AUGUSTANA-SYNODENS REFERAT. Femtioandra arsmoetet hallet
i Duluth, Minn., den 14.—20. Juni 1911. Rock Island,
Ill. Augustana Book Concerns Tryckeri. 392 pages.

The fifty-second convention of the Augustana Synod was attended by 231 delegates. In the President's Report we find the following: "The second point to which I wish to call the Synod's attention is the question regarding the instruction of our children and youths, and the injury which the state-schools are causing to Christianity by not confining themselves to their own domain. In all reports from conferences the opinion is expressed that the Sunday-school, while accomplishing much good, is nevertheless insufficient for a thorough

Christian training such as our children ought to receive. It is said that the Christian parochial school 'is not popular,' and most parents do not send their children to these schools. . . . It is considered sufficient if the children attend the public school, the Sunday-school, and catechetical instruction prior to confirmation. If our congregations are not to perish,—and that in the near future,—a radical change must soon be effected. Children and young people who do not from the beginning receive a thorough knowledge of Christianity, rarely become church-members, or if they do, it is merely *pro forma* and for a season, and they seldom manifest any interest in the church and spiritual affairs. Matters would not be quite so bad if the state schools, or public, or people's schools, the high-schools, and the universities would stay within the limits which the law has fixed for them, that is, if they would remain neutral in religious matters. But that is not the case. There is a general effort made to instill a certain view of God and the universe, and to build on this view a conception of morals which departs from the Biblical view of God and the universe, and from Christian ethics based on this view. Permit me to submit a portion of a lecture which was held by the Superintendent of the School for Mechanics and Arts (?) of the University of Minnesota on May 16. The speaker said amongst other things: 'There is a difference between sectarian and religious teaching. While the Church has been qualified for teaching dogmas, it has not, by doing this, given nourishment to the child's natural sense of religion. The teachers must change their method, and give them a religious education. By religious education I do not mean an education that is out of harmony with scientific principles. We must always bear in mind that there is a natural law in the spiritual world, and that the law of evolution makes its influence felt in religion just as well as in other things. The scientific standpoint is the only standpoint that we may occupy in regard to religion. The Church cannot furnish this nourishment, if it cannot, through evolution, reach a degree of unity enabling it to forget its dogmatic and particular teachings and promulgate a broad, scientific religion. But this is hardly to be expected. It remains for teachers to become leaders for the social and religious life of society, and to bring about in every child a new experience which will become a rational and scientific religion, permeated by faith, and which will afford us a look into the border-land of actual life where nothing is found that contradicts our own conception of nature's laws.' What do you think of this? This is not an exceptional utterance; for this view of religion is quite common in all state-schools and, as we perceive, is diametrically opposed to the Bible, the God of the Bible, and the Christian understanding.

This state of affairs is fraught with great danger, because most Reformed church-bodies in America shelter these same rationalistic views. And instead of becoming aroused in view of the danger and raising a prompt protest, they rejoice in view of the new state-religion. Here and there within the Lutheran Church men have begun to sound an alarm. And this is proper, for the danger is greater than most men believe. We must not become rationalists, though we have our dwellings and homes in America. And we know for a certainty that we have the civil law for our protection against any attempt to introduce a certain religion in our state-schools. Our own schools are in great danger. They are exposed to the danger of fraternizing more than is good for them with the state-schools and other schools, with men and views that are more or less rationalistic in their conception of religion. But since this, as is claimed, is in the interest of science and for the purpose of promoting universal enlightenment, people do not suspect any danger. If our educational institutions become infected with the prevailing rationalism, sound Lutheranism has no future in America. But I am assured that the Augustana Synod will engage in an honest fight for its faith and confession." (p. 31 f.) This appeal from the President drew a response from the Synod in the form of a resolution which was submitted in English as follows:

The Synod hereby expresses its firm conviction that the educational institutions of the State should confine themselves strictly within the limitations imposed upon them by the State, to the end that they may not in any manner or degree counteract the influence of the Christian home and the Church so far as religious instruction and practice is concerned, and that they may not disseminate doctrines subversive of the Christian religion. And furthermore be it

Resolved, That we as a Synod strongly protest against the introduction of dancing and theatrical performances in our public schools; and that a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the State Superintendents of public instructions of the several states of our nation. (p. 39 f.)

It is good to fight for a non-religious state-school. But we may do this without omitting another duty, *viz.*, fighting for a religious church-school. — Augustana College at Rock Island, Ill., reported the dedication of the Denkmann Memorial Library on May 31. — \$21,200 were expended in one year for the support of missionaries in the home field. The Board of Missions was directed to safeguard Swedish interests in Cuba and Australia. — About \$44,000 were needed for the Synod's foreign missions in India, China, Persia, and Porto Rico. — Augustana Book Concern was instructed to issue a course of graded lessons for Sunday-schools to cover 14 years, from the fifth to the sixteenth. — An English Field Secretary was appointed. — The work of the Sabbath Observance Association was endorsed, and the

Association's support recommended. — President Taft's endeavors in behalf of the establishment of the world's peace were endorsed, and a greeting was sent to the President. — Greetings were exchanged with the United Norwegian Synod. — Dr. E. Norelius was elected *Praeses emeritus*; the new President is Dr. L. A. Johnston. — The following statistics for 1910 show the present status, and increase or decrease, as compared with the preceding year, of the Augustana Synod: Ministers, 625 (+ 14); congregations, 1145 (+ 21); church buildings, 1020 (+ 24); parsonages, 503 (+ 9); value of two preceding, \$9,325,334 (+ \$545,570); debt on same, \$1,225,102 (+ \$38,324); parishioners, 261,713 (+ 3,304), of these 172,239 (+ 5,256) are communicants; baptized: children of members, 4,957 (— 39); of non-members, 7,021 (+ 42); adults, 83 (— 42); confirmed, 7,965 (— 348); received: by letter, 6,819 (+ 761); on profession, 2,958 (+ 149); children, 4,577 (+ 701); removed: communicants, 5,532 (+ 202); children, 2,108 (— 62); deceased: communicants, 1,903 (+ 103); children, 626 (+ 38); dropped, 5,665 (— 278); excommunicated, 23 (+ 15); married: members, 1,449 (— 174); non-members, 3,117 (+ 226); buried, non-members, 3,120 (— 135); parochial schools, 3,361 (— 135)¹⁾, with 573 (+ 14) teachers and 18,611 (+ 148) scholars; Sunday-schools: 9,309 (— 1) teachers and 73,084 (+ 1,416) scholars; contributions: to Synodical Treasury, \$4,122.72 (+ \$390.06); to Augustana College and Seminary, \$95,519.99 (+ \$54,803.07); to Home Missions, \$14,351.08 (+ \$1,216.30); to Foreign Missions, \$32,430.51 (+ \$9,026.73); to Immigrant Mission, \$3,776.76 (+ \$1,182.96); to Pension Fund, \$2,219.70 (— \$507.42); to Church Extension, \$4,415.95 (— \$742.61); to Deaconess Institute, \$479.94 (— \$41.19); to other charities, \$19,677.28 (+ \$7,998.11).

THE CHURCH THE BODY OF CHRIST. A Sermon Preached in Albany, September 27, 1910, before the Synod of New York of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, by *George U. Wenner*, President of the Synod. Lutheran Publication Society, 1424 Arch St., Philadelphia. 21 pages. 15 cts.

Dr. Wenner offers his testimony in behalf of the ancient doctrine of the *ecclesia una sancta catholica* which was reestablished in the Lutheran Church over and against the error of Rome, which makes the Church nothing but a visible organism, and over and against Reformed error, which reduces the Church to the phantasm of Plato's state. The text, Eph. 1, 22. 23, we could wish to see more search-

1) These numbers stand for weeks of instruction.

ingly investigated. There is a great deal in the bold figure of the *κεφαλή* — *σῶμα*, and in the *πλήρωμα* that has not been stated. The latter expression is taken in the sense of vessel, or receptacle. This signification of the term is very rare in Greek literature. The preponderance of usage has given to *πλήρωμα* the meaning "that which fills," not, "that which is filled." — The sayings: *Ubi ecclesia, ibi Spiritus Dei*, and: *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, are properly rejected in the sense in which Rome employs them; but these sayings state a truth that is independent of the claims of Rome. As applied to the *Una Sancta*, they cannot be rejected.

THE PEW TO THE PULPIT, or Letters from Laymen. P. Anstadt & Sons, 224 Apsley St., Philadelphia. 64 pages. 20 cts.

A member of the General Synod's Ministerial Association of Philadelphia had been appointed to conduct a discussion on the subject noted above. He decided to address to about fifty laymen, regardless of their denominational connection, the question, "What would you have me say to the preachers?" The answers as received are given in this pamphlet without mention of names. They are published by order of the Association. Some of the answers are wise, most of them otherwise, and the action of the Association and its inquiring member is a *testimonium paupertatis*. There is not a criticism or suggestion offered in these letters but has been offered *ad nauseam* before. He must be an unusually obtuse parson who has not known these things before. Most of them are told to the classes at theological seminaries. The Association might have spent its time more profitably in a review of Pastoral Theology, especially the chapter on pastoral tact and decorum.

ENGLISH SYNONYMS AND ANTONYMS. By *James C. Fernald*. 564 pages. \$1.50 net.

A DESK-BOOK OF ERRORS IN ENGLISH. By *Frank H. Vize-telly*, F. S. A. 232 pages. 75 cts. net.

HOW TO SPEAK IN PUBLIC. By *Grenville Kleiser*. 533 pages. Funk & Wagnalls Co. New York. \$1.25 net. — Above three books may be ordered from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

All these works are old acquaintances and friends. The first has for years been mentioned, along with other *necessaria* or *desiderata*, to the classes in English Homiletics at Concordia Seminary. — The last-named volume is now out in its seventh edition. The First Part

("Mechanics of Elocution"), with the system of exercises provided, is especially valuable. But there are valuable suggestions also in the Second Part ("Mental Aspects," viz., as these affect speaking), and in the Third Part ("Public Speaking").

PURITY AND TRUTH SERIES:

By Sylvanus Stall: *What a Young Boy Ought to Know*; 193 pages. *What a Young Man Ought to Know*; 270 pages. *What a Young Husband Ought to Know*; 284 pages. *What a Man of Forty-Five Ought to Know*; 284 pages. By Mrs. Mary Wood-Allen, M. D.: *What a Young Girl Ought to Know*; 194 pages. *What a Young Woman Ought to Know*; 272 pages. By Mrs. Emma F. A. Drake, M. D.: *What a Young Wife Ought to Know*; 293 pages. *What a Woman of Forty-Five Ought to Know*; 211 pages. Each book appears in a new revised edition, \$1.00 per volume. Vir Publishing Co., Philadelphia.—Also to be had at Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

These books treat, purposely and professionally, what society regards as avoided, and what some would make forbidden, subjects. It is true that there is danger in the telling of these things. But there is greater danger in their not telling them. One reason why they are not told is, because many persons whom nature or their official position has authorized to tell them are not qualified for the task through their own ignorance. Another reason for the appalling silence on these matters, which prevails in society and strikes one not infrequently as a studied silence, is the consciousness of most people that they lack the necessary tact for telling these things properly. We have expressed our mind on this class of literature in our review of Dr. Stevens' *Chastity and Health* (vol. XIII, p. 63 f.). While we believe that there is a harmful way of communicating knowledge such as is contained in these books, and that there are persons so awkward as to debar them from service such as these books would render, our sympathies, nevertheless, are all on the side of those who think that the best interests of the race are consulted by a professional publicity rather than by a conventional, often guilty, suppression of the facts of self and sex. We are not surprised, therefore, to behold the long list of eminent men and women who have endorsed these books. We think, however, that the price might be reduced. And it is necessary, too, to state that not every argument or illustration of the author is good. Ideas, e. g., like the one on p. 29 of book No. 4, which declares wickedness progressive even after the judgment, cannot be established from the text in Revelation.

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XVI.

APRIL, 1912.

No. 2.

WALTHER THE LUTHERAN.

(Continued.)

When Walther wrote the Preface to the third volume of *Der Lutheraner*, which we reproduced in our last article, events had occurred which can safely be set down as practical results of his testimony in behalf of genuine Lutheranism, and which foreshadowed Walther's activity as an organizer of the scattered forces of confessional Lutheranism in America.

And first, the immediate effect of Walther's outspoken defense of the original position of the Lutheran Church in doctrine and polity proved to be separating, disintegrating, disorganizing. Echoes of his testimony began to be heard in the councils of the Lutheran bodies operating at the time in the United States. There were mutterings of discontent on the part of men whose conscience had been touched by what they had read or heard of Walther's work. The confessional writings of the Church were being studied, present conditions and practices were being measured and tested by the standards of the Lutheran Church, and protests for conscience' sake were being raised against deviations from the Lutheran norm. Some of these documents deserve to be handed down to posterity, in order that our children who are growing away from the use of the language of their fathers may be enabled to recall at a later time what were the distressing conditions out of which the Missouri Synod ultimately arose, and what were the elements that contributed toward its growth and gave it the distinguishing marks that still characterize this Synod.

On January 24, 1846, Walther published the following article: "In No. 21 of *Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, dated December 18th *ult.*, we find a document which eight Lutheran pastors and one teacher have addressed to the President of the General Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Ohio. In this document they state the reasons which have compelled them to sever their connection with the Synod aforementioned. They say: 'The *first* of these reasons is strictly of a churchly and confessional character, and rests on certain facts which have rendered it questionable to us whether the Synod is sincere and definite in its position and tendency as a church, and whether it takes a decided stand over and against the unionism of our times. These facts are as follows:

"(1) A year ago a conference in East Ohio had submitted to the Synod the question: Which synods are Lutheran? Synod deferred action on this question until the next year, but tabled the question at its last convention. In the mean time the spokesmen of the so-called Lutheran General Synod, which has but recently called itself the American Lutheran Church, are willfully treading the doctrine of our Church on the Sacraments under foot, and are setting up an anti-Lutheran practice, that of the Methodists, which is hostile to our Church.

"(2) Some of the undersigned had requested the Synod to remove the unionistic formula of distribution now in use among us at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, which formula begins: "Christ says," etc. Their petition was refused; on the contrary, it was recommended to the members of the Synod as being in accordance with their duty that in their official acts they use the Book of Forms introduced in 1842. This book is unchurchly and Calvinistic in all the formulas for absolution which it presents, and in its form for conferring ordination does not make the Confessions of the Lutheran Church binding upon the applicant.

"(3) An important petition had been addressed to the Synod by some of the undersigned. The petition asked,

“(a) That the Synod officially accept all the confessional writings of the Lutheran Church;

“(b) That the Synod raise a protest against the false teaching of the so-called Lutheran General Synod regarding the Sacrament;

“(c) That the Synod thoroughly revise its method of examining candidates for the ministry;

“(d) That the Synod, when admitting a candidate to ordination, make all the confessional writings of the Lutheran Church binding upon him;

“(e) That the Synod do not permit its ministers to serve Reformed-Lutheran congregations, thus practically approving of the false unionism of our time.

“‘This petition was delayed and, because of insignificant technical errors of the committee reporting on the same, was recommitted. Finally, when the petitioners had withdrawn their petition, and had offered only this brief resolution: That the Synod henceforth accept all the confessional writings of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and solemnly enjoin upon its candidates for ordination to consider themselves bound by the same,—action upon this matter, in a session of the Ministerium, was again postponed for three years. It was plain to us, from these transactions, that the Synod, in the majority of its members, possessed no sincere willingness to staunchly represent our Church in its battle with the false unionism of our times.

“‘As a *second* reason for their separation the undersigned offer the fact, that the Synod has, in a faithless manner and contrary to the demands of justice, deprived the Seminary at Columbus, which is the only Seminary among the four Lutheran Seminaries in our country that is *German* by its constitution, of its German character.’

“The document concludes as follows: ‘Inasmuch, then, as the Synod has decidedly violated the original constitution of the Seminary, and—this being, indeed, the main reason for

our separation—inasmuch as the Synod takes the crying need of our Church and the inroads which a false unionism is making upon it so little to heart that it refuses to grant even the justest petitions for meeting the most grievous needs of the Church; and inasmuch as the Synod has no ears and eyes for oral and written explanations of these petitions, and at this moment can hardly be regarded as acting in sheer ignorance; therefore we consider ourselves in duty bound to quit the synodical organization to which we have belonged hitherto. In conclusion, we beg to offer the urgent and cordial request that the Synod may not continue in its present state, and we implore the Synod for Christ's sake, for the sake of the souls which were dearly bought by Christ, for the sake of the pure and unadulterated Confessions of our Church, and for the sake of the heavy responsibility resting upon the Synod, no longer, from fear or favor of men, to shun and flee from the good fight and from offering its sincere testimony against the false unionism and syncretism of our times.

“FRIEDR. WINKLER, *Lutheran Pastor at Detroit, Mich.*

“DR. W. SIHLER, *Lutheran Pastor at Fort Wayne.*

“A. SCHMIDT, *Pastor in Cleveland.*

“J. G. BUEGER, *Pastor in Hancock Co.*

“J. A. EENST, *Pastor of the German Evangelical Lutheran Congregation at Neudettelsau, Union Co., O.*

“WILH. RICHMANN, *Lutheran Pastor in Bern Township, Fairfield Co., O.*

“ANDR. SAUPERT, *Lutheran Pastor in Evansville, Vanderburg Co., Ind.*

“AUG. SELLE, *German Evangelical Pastor in Columbiana Co., O.*

“E. A. SCHUERMAN, *Teacher of the First German Evangelical Lutheran Congregation at Pittsburgh.*

“Cleveland, O., September 18, 1845.”

"It is with profound grief that we report these transactions to our readers. They show us, alas! that in America, too, no denomination has suffered such a grievous decay as the society of those who call themselves '*Lutheran*.' There is greater eagerness among all the sects of this country to preserve the false doctrines upon which they were founded, and which have given them their peculiar stamp, than there is determination among the so-called Lutherans of our country to keep the holy and pure doctrine, founded upon the clear Word of God, which by the ineffable grace of God has been committed to them. Aye, we behold the American Lutheran Church dominated, not only by carelessness and indifference, but even by hostility to the genuine Lutheran Church. The Lutheran Church of our country has retained nothing but the name; it has lost the old truth and the spirit of the old confessors.

"However, from the above report we also see that there is no reason why we should despair altogether of the subsistence of the Lutheran Church in America. It is manifest that God has taken His fan in hand to cleanse His threshing-floor, and to winnow His wheat. God is plainly resolved no longer to wink at the secret thieving of false saints and their fishing in troubled waters. God is beginning again, here and there, to open the eyes of some who view with horror the defection of which the Lutherans have become guilty. God is again raising up men here and there who call aloud, summoning their brethren to return to their first love which they have forsaken. God be praised! after a long winter the voice of the turtle is again heard in our land. (Song of Sol. 2, 11—13.) Up, up, then, my brethren! let us not sit by idly while false brethren are becoming more firmly united all the time for the purpose of undermining and removing the foundation of our Church. These false brethren, fighting treacherously as they do under our name, are more dangerous than our declared enemies: they are allied with our enemies, and yet dwell in our camp. True, He that sitteth in the heavens laughs, and the Lord hath them

in derision; for, 'though the sea roar and be troubled, though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof. Selah. There is a river, the streams whereof shall make glad the city of God, the holy place of the tabernacles of the Most High. God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved: God shall help her, and that right early.' However, while it is impossible to force Luther's doctrine, that is, the Word of God, out of the *world*, it is easily possible that *we* may lose our treasure (2 John 8. 9), and may be rejected as unfaithful stewards, if we do not hold fast the faithful Word (Tit. 1, 9—11), and earnestly contend for the faith (Jude 3). Therefore, let us, who do not make merely a hypocritical pretense of the Lutheran name, but mean to be and remain Lutherans in truth and deed,—let us close ranks, and rally again around the banner of the old, unalterable doctrine of our Church. Let us unite in prayer, asking God to arise for our help, that we may boldly teach His Word.¹⁾ Let us unite for the faithful confession of the truth. Let us unite for making war, with the sword of the Spirit, upon all falsifications of the truth. Let us unite for bearing the reproach with which the Lord is wont to distinguish His servants. Though we may not hope that by our united action the Church in these last grievous days will once more be brought to a flourishing and glorious condition, still we need not give up all hope that our testimony and our fighting will not be altogether in vain. We may be confident that we shall achieve praise for the Lord, and save many a soul from the error of its way."²⁾

On August 8, 1846, Walther published the following communication:—

"In the southern part of Michigan there are several colonies which were founded for the greater part by emigrants who originally were Lutherans. These people were first served with the Word and the Sacraments by the Reverend Schmidt of Ann Arbor, who later trained a few young men for the

1) See Luther's rendering of Ps. 12, 5.

2) *Der Lutheraner* 2, 42 f.

ministry and organized a so-called mission-synod with them. Their chief aim was directed toward establishing a mission among the Indians of Michigan, and they adopted the name 'German Lutheran Synod of Michigan.' Pastor Schmidt of Ann Arbor had also served the Lutheran congregation at Monroe. To the pastorate of this congregation Hattstaedt, a pupil of the Lutheran pastor Loehe in Franconian Bavaria, was called. Hattstaedt thus was brought into the membership of the Synod aforementioned. While he found in this Synod a great deal of ignorance as to what Lutheranism is, he found also that acceptance of all the confessional writings of the Lutheran Church of the pure confession was obligatory upon the members, and apparently there was the honest inclination to practice according to the Confessions. This induced Hattstaedt to call the attention of friends in the old country to this Synod and to its activity among the Indians in Michigan. As a result, the Franconians entered into a correspondence with the Michigan Synod, and, on receiving the definite statement that the Michigan Synod would carry on its mission on a strictly Lutheran basis, and would bind all its missionaries to adhere to all the confessional writings of our Church, the Franconians united with the Michigan Synod in a cooperative movement. The cooperation was begun in this way: The Lutheran candidates of the ministry Trautmann and Lochner were delegated to serve vacant German Lutheran congregations within the Synod of Michigan, and a small German Lutheran mission congregation, with its duly called pastor, A. Craemer, started from Franconia to aid in the mission to the Indians. Their plan was to locate somewhere on the Cass River, in the County of Saginaw, in the State of Michigan, and to carry on a mission among the Indians at Siboying, jointly with the missionaries that had come from Ann Arbor. Besides, Franconian Lutherans sent large sums of money for the support of this mission. In the mean time, Rev. Dumsér, an alumnus of the Basle Mission Institute, had arrived to serve the station at Siboying. This gentleman had been ordained in the old

country, however, without having been bound to the Confessions of our Church. He declared later that he must regard an unreserved restriction to the Confessions of our Church as a violation of his conscience. In addition, the fact was revealed that at a former time the so-called Lutheran Synod of Michigan had openly served several union congregations *as such* with the Word and the Sacraments. Pastors Hattstaedt, Craemer, Trautmann, and Lochner at once united in a protest against these offensive practices. They insisted that the un-Lutheran missionary Dumser must be expelled, and that the Synod must vindicate itself from the charge of having served union congregations *as such*. However, at the convention of the Michigan Synod in June of this year, there was a miscarriage of the very first motion, to expel the un-Lutheran missionary Dumser, who persisted in his refusal to be bound to the Confessions of our Church without reservation. Accordingly, Pastors Hattstaedt, Craemer, Trautmann, and Lochner felt in conscience bound, not only to sever their connection with the Synod of Michigan and to protest against the action of the Synod in failing to vindicate itself, but also to deposit with the President of the Synod the reasons for their withdrawal in the exact form in which they are given below."

From the "Declaration of Withdrawal" which is appended at the end of the communication, we learn that the Franconian pastors had first offered their resolution to expel Dumser at a conference meeting called for that purpose, and that this conference had referred the entire matter to the Synod for action at its next convention. The Synod met on June 24th and the following days. The Franconian pastors renewed their protest against the membership of Dumser, but before the Synod took action on their protest, the Mission Board of the Synod had made a report, recommending that Dumser be confirmed in his office and sent to the post for which he had been intended.

The "Declaration" closes with these words:

"We part from the Synod with sincere grief because of the un-Lutheran position which the Synod maintains in spite

of the clear testimony which we have offered. We pray the Lord of the Church that He may soon lead the Synod of Michigan to see, and to be convinced, that its position is dangerous, especially amid the conditions prevailing among the churches of our country; and that it is necessary for our dear Church of the pure confession, and for the prosperous operation of Lutheran Synods, to be firm and decided in *doctrine* and *practice*.

"Ann Arbor, Washtenaw Co., Mich. On June 25, 1846, the anniversary of the presentation of the Augsburg Confession.

"W. HATTSTAEDT, *Pastor at Monroe, Mich.*

"A. CRAEMER, *Pastor of the Lutheran Mission congregation at Frankenmuth, Saginaw Co., Mich.*

"FR. LOCHNER, *Pastor at Toledo, O.*

"J. TRAUTMANN, *Pastor at Danbury, O.*"³⁾

While these events were taking place in the West, a voice of dissent and protest was also being raised in the East. Fr. Wyneken, after completing his famous missionary tours through Western Ohio, Northern Indiana, and Southern Michigan, had consented to become the pastor of the Second Lutheran Church at Baltimore. He thus came to affiliate with the Pennsylvania Synod and, through that, with the General Synod. The spirit of this man had been exhibited to the readers of *Der Lutheraner* in the first volume,⁴⁾ when Walther announced his stirring brochure which summoned aid from Germany to relieve the spiritual distress of the scattered Lutherans of America. Even at that early date, Wyneken had declared against the unionistic tendency dominant in the American Lutheran Church. What he saw in his own Synod, made him a still more determined opponent to the hybrid Lutheranism of his day. His testimony was offered in behalf of consistent Lutheran teaching and practice within his own Synod, and met with similar results as that of the brethren noted. He, too, was ultimately compelled to withdraw from

3) *Der Lutheraner* 2, 98 f.

4) p. 31.

a body that proved unwilling to adopt the true basis of our Church as a norm for its doctrine and polity. And the rebuffs with which Wyneken met in the East drew him into closer union with the stalwart defenders of genuine Lutheranism whom he beheld arising in the West.

In the communication describing the withdrawal of the Franconian pastors from the Synod of Michigan, the following remark occurs: "The brethren who have thus withdrawn will at once join the genuinely Lutheran Synod which is about to be organized at Fort Wayne, Ind."⁵⁾ Thus, the sad disintegration which we had to note above was not a mere splitting up of the forces of Lutheranism in a senseless and selfish striving for individual ideas and pretensions. The disintegrating parts began to coalesce, and out of all the disunion with which the synodical bodies in those days were threatened there was to grow a union on a strictly confessional basis.

(To be continued.)

ROMANISM A PLAGIARISM ON PAGANISM.¹⁾

(Concluded.)

AURICULAR CONFESSION.

In the pagan Mysteries certain priests, called Kōes, heard the confession of the candidate for initiation, and put to him searching questions before purging the guilt away.

From Propertius, Tibullus, and Juvenal it appears that these questions were also very obscene.

The result of these Mysteries was great debauchery.

This paganism crept into Romanism, and from the pages of Peter Dens we learn what obscene questions were put by the confessor to the penitent, and from history we learn the disastrous results of auricular confession.

5) *Der Lutheraner* 2, 99.

1) The caption of the article in the last issue ("The Hierarchy") should be changed to the same as above.

On the complaint of a lady that her confessor had seduced her in the very church, Bishop Nectarius of Constantinople, about 390, forbade auricular confession. His successor, Chrysostom, says: "Neither do I constrain you to reveal your sins to men. Disclose your conscience before God. Lay open your wounds to Him and seek healing for them from Him."

In 1215, Innocent III made compulsory auricular confession a sacrament, to be done at least yearly, from seven years up.

Of this papal institution Cardinal Pallavicini says: "The throne of the priest is in the skies, and to him belongs it to administer the affairs of heaven. . . . Heaven receives from earth the power of judging. The Master must obey the servant and ratify above whatever the priest may decide here below." Again: "God Himself is bound to abide by the decisions of priests." (*The Catholic Priesthood*, with Card. M'Closky's approval.)

What is the result of this papal institution? Erasmus says a theologian of Louvain refused to absolve a priest who had confessed to guilt with over 200 nuns under his "spiritual direction." Pope Calixtus II, 1119—1122, speaks of woman "as a victim who found destruction where she sought salvation." Pope Alexander IV says in a bull: "The people, instead of being reformed, are corrupted by their pastors." In 1522, the Catholic princes of Germany at Nuernberg complained of the Confessional.

Pusey wrote that the Confessional "is the road by which a number of Christians go down to hell." (Tertullian, p. 315; in B. W-A., p. 197.)

PROCESSIONS.

Many heathen authors write of processions in honor of the gods and saints. Apuleius describes the "countless wax tapers and torches, seeming like stars fallen on the earth, the priests with tonsured heads carrying the relics of the omnipotent gods, . . . then one bearing the shrine wherein are inclosed

the holy mysteries, which include the sacred arcana of the magnificent religion."

Although Isaiah ridicules such processions and carrying of images, this paganism crept into the Roman Church. Gregory introduced them on a large scale in 590, when Rome suffered from a pestilence. When Cardinal Wiseman wished for such a penitential procession, the *London Times* said: "The historic idea is simple enough, and as old as old can be. We have it in Homer—the procession of Hecuba and the ladies of Troy to the shrine of Minerva, in the Acropolis of that city."

The Lupercalia were celebrated on February 15 with processions and the most outrageous immoralities. Instead of these pagan processions Pope Gelasius I introduced the candlemas processions, each one bearing a candle as a symbol of the light of Christ, at the purification of Mary.

Pope Liberius set Christmas for the Saturnalia and the feast of Mithras; that is, at the winter solstice.

The old Robigalia were held on the 25th of April, going on the Via Flaminia to the Pons Milvius. The Litania Major was held on the same day and went the same way, beginning in S. Lorenzo in Lucina.

The Ambarvalia procession around the fields were held in May to get the blessing of Ceres for the crops. This pagan thing was kept up by papal Rome. In 511, the Council of Orleans made these yearly processions a rule throughout France.

Mid waving of banners and singing of hymns the statue of Isis was carried around. At certain stations the procession paused, and sacrifices were made. For the pagan Isis the papal "host" was substituted, and we have the Corpus Christi day procession.

Polydore Vergil writes: "The Romans and other nations made superstitious processions. From these, doubtless, is it that the custom among us is derived. For in the pomp of our processions it is usual to have some pleasantries go before, as files of soldiers, foot and horse, some figures also of ingenious construction for ridicule, such particularly as open a wide

gaping mouth and make a clattering noise with their teeth; these are mixed with other diversions. The prophets are personated; one acts David, another Solomon, others are habited as queens, artificial wings are tied to some children, and they are made to sing. . . . Calixtus, or, as some think, Urban, did begin the embering days quarterly for the protection of fruits ordained for the sustenance of men and beasts. Albeit, I rather take it to be imitation of the old Roman feasts which thrice in the year held sacrifices for the prosperous increase of their corn: one, vinalia, for their wines; another, rubigalia, for all their grain, lest it should be mildewed; a third, floralia, for their fruits. . . . The use of dancing, as Livy saith, came from the Horuscans to Rome, which we execute much on holidays as they did, not without slander to our religion and damage of character. As for masks, they be so devilish that no honesty can be pretended to color them. Zacharias, Bishop of Rome, made a decree against them; but this availeth nothing."

THE UNBLOODY SACRIFICE.

In Jer. 7, 18 and 44, 19 the Lord condemns the making of cakes for the Queen of Heaven. These cakes were round to represent the disk of the sun; they were marked with a cross (*Tau*), and stamped with I. H. S. (Isis, Horus, Seb—the Mother, the Child, the Father of the gods).

This unbloody sacrifice spread from Assyria to the Paphians in Cyprus, and Tacitus tells us no blood was allowed to be offered on the altars of the Paphian Venus. In the fourth century, when the Queen of Heaven, under the name of the Virgin Mary, was beginning to be worshiped in the Christian Church, this "unbloody sacrifice" was also brought in. Epiphanius tells us the women of Arabia adopted this worship; they were treated as heretics, and branded with the name of Collyridians, from the Greek name for the cake they used, as they had been offered to Ceres in the Thesmophoria, the heathen feast of harvest.

In earliest heathen Rome neither images nor sacrifice of

animals were permitted, only cakes of fine wheaten flour (the *farre pium*), called "the unbloody sacrifice." At the end of the service the priest dismissed the congregation by loudly saying, "*Ite, missa est.*"

Just so later in papal Rome.

As in the worship of Isis the priest elevated the holy of holies for the adoration of the faithful, so in the mass the priest elevates the host for the adoration of the faithful.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

On the eve of a festival of a god in India images of mud from a sacred stream are brought to the houses, and priests recite texts inviting the god to the house and into the mud image. The eyes, nose, ears, mouth, hands, feet of the idol are touched in turn, by which, and by the recital of certain texts, a notable miracle is done: the image of mud is now supposed to be a living god. Only Brahmans may approach it, and their services are needed to present the gifts the family wish to offer.

As the Brahman turns a mud idol into a living god, so the Romish priest turns a piece of bread into God, makes God, and then sacrifices Him in the mass!

Liguori writes: "In this Sacrament He (Christ) is pleased to obey man himself. Yes, the King of Heaven descends from His throne in obedience to the voice of man, and remains upon our altars, according to His pleasure. . . . In this Sacrament He obeys as many creatures as there are priests upon earth."

The heathen taunted the early Christians that they had no sacrifices in their churches. They replied that they offered to God what was better than a sacrifice of material things—faith, love, obedience. Clearly, at that time there was no sacrifice of the mass, no transubstantiation.

About 831, Radbertus, a Benedictine of Corbie, taught transubstantiation. Ratramnus, another monk of the same place, refuted him; so did Berengar of Tours, who was protected by Pope Gregory VII, who would not permit Berengar to be called a heretic.

In 1215, Pope Innocent III, in the Fourth Lateran Council, decreed the dogma of transubstantiation as necessary to salvation.

"Was any man ever so mad as to take that which he feeds on for a God?" asks Cicero (*De Natura Deorum*, lib. III, c. 16). Not in pagan Rome, but in papal Rome. Either the popish priest makes God, and then sacrifices Him, or else all papists worship a bit of bread. Choose your horn of the dilemma!

Pope Julius I (336—352) says: "It is an ordinance of God and an apostolic behest that the bread and the wine should both be given separately to the laity."

Pope Leo I (446) says: "Those who receive the body, but not the blood of Jesus Christ, shall be expelled from the community."

Pope Gelasius (492) condemned "those who take the bread only, and not the wine, as persons who cherish superstition; either they shall receive both forms, or shall be refused both, because one and the same mystery cannot be divided."

Pope Urban II (1094) says: "None shall be admitted to the altar unless they take both the bread and the wine."

Pope Paschal II (1118) writes to Pontius, Bishop of Cluny, enforcing twofold acceptation, and exhorting that prelate "not to permit any departure to be made, through a novel and human institution, from that which Christ the Master ordained and did."

The Council of Constance, 1414—1418, reversed the teaching of these infallible Popes, not to mention Christ and the apostles, by robbing the communicants of the cup.

AUTHORITY.

The Brahmans reserved the Vedas for their own use. This knowledge gave them such power that even the gods were obliged to do their bidding. If others desired a boon, they had to seek the help of the priests and pay a round sum for it.

Robbed of the Vedas, the low-caste people were given other books specially prepared for them and written with a purpose.

St. Chrysostom writes: "Let us not neglect the reading of Holy Scriptures, for that is a device of the devil which forbids us to behold the treasure lest we should thereby be enriched."

This "device of the devil" was introduced into popery.

As in Hinduism, so in Romanism. The Bible was taken from the people and reserved for the clergy, who were to explain it for the people. The creed of Pope Pius IV says it is Holy Mother Church's "business to judge of the true sense and interpretation of them," i. e., the Scriptures. Mgr. Talbot wrote from the Vatican to Cardinal Manning: "What is the province of the laity? To hunt, to shoot, to entertain. These matters they understand; but to meddle with ecclesiastical matters they have no right at all."

When it was proposed to give the Bible to the conquered Moors in Arabic, Cardinal Ximenes, Prime Minister of Spain under Ferdinand and Isabella, said it was "casting pearl before swine," and he objected to give the Bible to Spaniards born in Christian homes; the Spanish language should be reserved for such writings as good men might write for the good of the common people.

For giving the Bible in English, Wiclif was called "the devil's instrument and the Church's enemy."

Quesnel said: "It is useful and necessary, at all times and in all places, and for all kinds of persons, to study the Scriptures, and to understand its spirit, its piety, and its mysteries."

Pope Clement XI, in 1713, solemnly condemned this truth.

SALVATION.

In India an interested priesthood has made the way of salvation difficult. Duties are multiplied, each in turn declared necessary. From the cradle to the grave, and beyond, every step must be taken under the guidance of a priest. And yet salvation is not assured.

As in heathenism, so in Romanism. From baptism to confirmation, to confession, to absolution, to marriage, to extreme unction, to burial, to purgatory, everything must be done under the direction and pay of the priest; and after all is done, and paid for, the good Catholic cannot be sure of his salvation. The Council of Trent says: "No man can know with infallible assurance of faith that he has obtained the grace of God."

But the Bible teaches a Christian to say joyfully: "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him against that day," 2 Tim. 1, 12. "There is now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus," Rom. 8, 1. 31—39.

In India, conduct is of two kinds—"necessary" and "meritorious." "Necessary" works must be done in order to escape punishment and hell; "meritorious" works are surplus good works, which may be used to pay off the debts made by sins.

By pilgrimages, gifts to the gods, presents to the Brahmans, acts of worship, building of temples, and similar good works, a man may more than balance his sins.

It is a common practice for a man to wound his body, swing on a lofty bamboo with an iron hook in his flesh, make a journey on foot a thousand miles to fetch a vessel of water from the sacred Ganges, and transfer this good work to any willing to pay for it.

In China a like system is in use. The virtue earned in a given year can be carried forward into the next year, and the debt of any year can be wiped out by extra good works in the following year. The surplus can be used for his welfare here and hereafter, or it can be given to others.

This heathen superstition was introduced by Romanism. Cardinal Bellarmine says: "Our good works do merit eternal life *condignly*, not only by reason of God's covenant and acceptance, but also by reason of the work itself." Vasquez says: "Seeing the works of good men do merit eternal life,

there is no need that any condign merit, such as that of Christ, should interpose, to the end that eternal life might be rendered to them."

The Council of Trent distinctly teaches that "Men are not justified by the imputation of Christ's righteousness alone." But that is just what the Bible teaches. "We conclude that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the Law," Rom. 3, 28; 4, 5; 2 Cor. 5, 19.

In 1350, Pope Clement VI teaches that the work of Christ, and the good works of the Virgin Mary, and the good works of all saints, form a huge fund, or treasury, in charge of the Pope, from which he can sell to any one as many good works as are needed.

Such forgiveness was sold by Tetzel, in 1517, and this scandal started Luther on the work of the Reformation.

In 1552, the Roman Catholic princes of Germany drew up a list of grievances against the Pope, and also complained that the people were encouraged to all sins by being able to buy forgiveness in this life and the next.

In Egypt, Enubis balances the good and the evil works of the dead, and so decides their fate; in Romanism the Archangel Michael has this duty.

As long as a man is uncertain of the result of the Judgment, he naturally fears to die. This drives him to seek the help of the priest in death, and to arrange for his further help after death. This gives Rome's priests such awful power over her people. In a famous letter of Pere le Chaise, confessor of Louis XIV of France, we see how the fear of St. Michael worked. "Many a time since (an atrocious crime of the King) when I have been at confession, I have shook hell about his ears, and made him sigh, fear, and tremble, before I would give him absolution. By this I saw he had still an inclination to me and was ere long to be under my government. So I set the baseness of the action before him by telling the whole story, and how wicked it was, and that he could not be forgiven till he had done some good action to balance that and expiate

the crime. Whereupon he at last asked me what he must do. I told him that he must root out all the heretics from his kingdom." And thus was brought about the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes—and the massacre of the Huguenots, the French Protestants.

When the old Roman Pontifex Maximus, Emperor Vespasian, needed the money, he sold pardons to criminals; when the new Roman Pontifex Maximus, Pope Leo X, needed the money, he sold pardons to criminals. "We, Leo, have granted John Tetzel the most ample power of communicating indulgences, so that he can absolve in all cases, specially and generally, and in any manner soever, reserved to the Roman Apostolic See, such as the same see would be rightly consulted upon; also of absolving from sins repented of, confessed, and forgotten, and even of those not repented of, and not confessed; and, in the moment of death, of bestowing a universal remission of all sins, guilt, and penalty, to be paid in purgatory; also to shut the gates of hell, and to open the gate of Paradise."

"Let indulgences and all other heathenism be abolished."
(*A Modernist's Letters to Pius X*, p. 188.)

PERSECUTIONS.

Heathen Rome put down the Bacchanalian worship about 200 B. C.; later it made war on the worship of Isis; human sacrifices were forbidden in Africa; Claudius tried to root out Druidism in Gaul. For about three hundred years the heathen could always say to the Christian, "You have no right to live." The sword of Damocles hung over every Christian's neck, and it often came down in bloody persecutions.

With the Emperor Constantine the persecution of the heathen began about 325; it was continued by his successors, by Charles the Great, Olaf Tryggvason, and others.

When James and John would call fire from heaven upon some who rejected Christ's words, the Savior was horrified and rebuked them, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to

save them," Luke 9, 54—56. When Peter took the sword to defend Christ, the Savior sternly commanded, "Put up again thy sword into his place!" Matt. 26, 50—54.

In the spirit of Christ Tertullian said: "It is not the part of religion to force religion, which must be accepted willingly, not by force." And Lactantius said: "Nothing is so voluntary as religion." And the schismatic leader Donatus remonstrated: "What has the emperor to do with the Church?"

And yet, when the Popes became temporal rulers, they continued the work of persecution. Their rule was very unpopular. There were 161 rebellions of papal subjects between 896 and 1859, an average of sixteen in every century, says Marion Crawford in *Ave Roma Immortalis* (Vol. II, p. 73).

Think of the Waldenses and Albigenses, the Spanish inquisition, the papal inquisition, the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the expulsion of the Salzburgers!

The inquisition punished in Spain alone 258,782 people; in the Netherlands 100,000 were killed according to Hugo Grotius, 500,000 according to the Prince of Orange.

Montanus, Secretary of the Holy Office for some years, writes, in 1560, that the familiars of the inquisition "were bawds, thieves, shifters, and the vilest sort of people, that live by filching, that cannot or will not hold their hands if they should hang for it. Such friends accused honest men and pure women of heresy, and then tortured the men and violated the women."

"*Roma semper eadem*," Rome is always the same, she never changes. Had Rome the power to-day, Rome would persecute. This is not an inference and a charge of Protestantism, it is the admission, nay, the proud boast of Rome, expressed even by her infallible Pope. Pope Pius IX, in his notorious *Syllabus* of December, 1864, calls it a grievous error to suppose that "the Church has not the right to use force, . . . that the ecclesiastical authority ought not to exercise this prerogative

without the permission and assent of the civil government." (Sec. V, §§ 24. 20.)

Joachim dei Segni, while Archbishop of Imola, approved cordially this *Syllabus*, and when he was Pope Leo XIII, he in many encyclicals lamented that he could not use force, that is, persecute, that is, set up the inquisition.

Ovid describes Janus as follows: "He, holding in his right hand a staff and in his left a key, uttered these accents to me from the mouth of his front face: . . . 'Whatever thou beholdest around thee, the sky, the sea, the air, the earth, all these have been shut up, and are opened by my hand. In my power alone is the guardianship of the vast universe, and the prerogative of turning the hinge is entirely my own. . . . I preside over the portals of heaven; through my agency Jupiter himself doth pass and repass.'" (*Fasti*, Bk. I.)

Since the earliest times the Pontifex Maximus in Rome was the chief official, the judge and arbiter of things divine and human, to whom the king and, later, the consuls were subordinate.

The heiress, administratrix, and advocate of this view of political law was the city of Rome with her Pontifex Maximus, and it stands to reason that she employed these principles to her own advantage. (Chamberlain, *Foundations*, II, pp. 8. 9.)

Renan writes: "If at the present day we wished to recover a living image of paganism, we should have to look for it in some village lying forgotten in the depths of a [Catholic] country district altogether behind the times." (*Infl. of Rome on Christianity*, p. 32.)

Harnack, in July, 1889, called Roman Catholicism "a new form of paganism."

Gibbon writes: "If, in the beginning of the fifth century, Tertullian or Lactantius had been suddenly raised from the dead to assist at the festival of some popular saint or martyr, they would have gazed with astonishment and indignation on the profane spectacle which had succeeded to the pure and spiritual worship of a Christian congregation. As soon as the

doors of the church were thrown open, they must have been offended by the smoke of incense, the perfume of flowers, and the glare of lamps and tapers, which diffused at noonday a gaudy, superfluous, and, in their opinion, sacrilegious light." (Chap. 28.) Again: "It must ingenuously be confessed that the ministers of the Catholic Church imitated the profane model they were so impatient to destroy." Gieseler writes: "Pagan dresses for the priests, pagan festivals for the people, pagan doctrines and ideas of all sorts, are everywhere in vogue." (II, pp. 40. 45.)

Jovinian, and all who resisted the pagan ideas and pagan practices, were excommunicated and persecuted. (Gibbon V, p. 176.)

P. T. Forsyth of Cambridge writes that Luther's reformation "was a war with paganism, but it was the more terrible Christian paganism." (p. 19.) Luther's reformation "saved the Church from a pagan corruption." (*Rome, Reform, and Reaction*, p. 82.)

"The system . . . goes back to a secular origin in the pagan imperial system of ancient Rome." (Hobhouse, *Bampton Lectures*, 1909, p. 212.)

Hobbes says, "If a man considers the origin of this great ecclesiastical Dominion, he will easily perceive that the papacy is no other than the ghost of the deceased Roman Empire, sitting crowned upon the grave thereof."

Ruskin, in his "Stones of Venice," says: "The papacy is entirely heathen in all its principles."

Dean Merivale, in his "Four Lectures on Some Epochs of Early Church History," says: "The real corruption of the age was shown in the unstinted adoption of pagan usages in the ceremonial of the Christian Church. . . . The whole essence of paganism was percolating the ritual of the Church and the hearts of the Christian multitude. The fasts prescribed by the Church had their parallel in the abstinence imposed by certain pagan creeds; the monarchism they extolled so warmly was in its origin a purely pagan institution; the canonizing of saints

and martyrs, the honors paid them, and the trust reposed in them, were simply a revival of the old pagan mythologies; the multiplication of formal ceremonies, with processions, and lights, and incense, and vestments, with images, and pictures, and votive offerings, was a mere pagan appeal to the senses; the general aspect of Christian devotion was a faint and rather frivolous imitation of the old pagan ritual."

The Rev. E. Edwin Hall, chaplain of the American Legation at Rome and of the American Church at Florence, made a careful study of the early history and of the modern characteristics of Roman Catholicism, and in July, 1889, wrote in the quarterly *Sabbath Outlook*: "Soon after the so-called conversion of Constantine, the Church entered on its apostasy from the primitive simplicity and purity which marked its earlier history. Pagans in vast multitudes pressed into the Christian fold, bringing with them old practices and customs, and filling the places of Christian worship with the pageantry and the ornaments which characterized the worship of the gods in heathen temples. These unconverted millions became only nominally Christian, impressing their character, together with the doctrines, rites, and forms of pagan religion, upon the Christian Church."

Sir George Sinclair, in his "Letters to the Protestants of Scotland" (First Series, p. 121) says: "Romanism is a refined system of Christianized heathenism, and chiefly differs from its prototype in being *more* treacherous, *more* cruel, *more* dangerous, *more* intolerant."

Dr. James D. Eaton, of the American Board, said in New York City: "The prevailing religion [in Mexico] is Roman Catholic, but it is so largely debased by admixtures of heathenism that it was pronounced by a French chaplain, in the time of Maximilian, to be a 'baptized paganism.'" (*Converted Catholic*, June, 1911, p. 209.)

Beda Venerabilis, in Book I, chap. 30, writes: "From that time the worship of the Roman Catholic Church, in its forms and ceremonies, has been more clearly identified with

the paganism of ancient Rome than with the religion of the New Testament. The customs of pagan religion were only baptized with Christian names. Gregory the Great, in the latter part of the sixth century, ignoring the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit and the power of the Gospel, directed the Monk Augustine, whom he sent to convert the idolaters of England, 'not to suspend or abolish the pagan festivals nor the customs of their worship, but rather retain them, contenting himself with substituting for the names of false gods the names of saints borne by their temples, and whose relics were deposited in them.'"

Fauchet says: "The bishops of this kingdom employ all means to gain men to Christ, converting to their use some pagan ceremonies."

Pierre Moussard quotes William de Choul, counselor to the king: "Many institutions in our religion have been borrowed and transformed from Egyptian and pagan ceremonies, such as tunics and surplices, priestly ornaments for the head, bowing at the altar, the solemnity at mass, etc."

Baronius says: "It was permitted the Church to transfer to pious uses those ceremonies which the pagans had wickedly applied in a superstitious worship. . . . Thus the pagan festivals, laden with superstition, were changed into the praiseworthy festivals of the martyrs."

Polydore Vergil says: "The Church has borrowed many customs from the religion of the Romans and other pagans."

Aringhus, in his "Subterraneous Rome," acknowledges this conformity between the pagan and popish rites, and defends the admission of the ceremonies of heathenism into the service of the Church, by the authority of their wisest popes and governors, who found it necessary, he says, in the conversion of the Gentiles, to dissemble and wink at many things, and yield to the times."

Cardinal Wiseman, in the second of his "Letters to John Poynder, Esq., upon his work entitled, 'Popery in Alliance with Heathenism'" (London, 1836), grants the facts and concedes

the parallels, and even adds many more items of resemblance, and says the Emperor Julian made the same charge, as did Faustus the Manichee, and then defends the policy of conforming Christianity to the popular paganism to secure conversions.

Cardinal Newman admits in regard to "holy water" and many other things that were, as he says, "the very instruments and appendages of demon-worship,"—that they were all of pagan origin, and "sanctified by adoption into the Church." (*Development*, pp. 359. 360, in Hislop, p. 200.)

Walter Rauschenbusch says: "The ascetic ideal was originally due to non-Christian influences." (*Christianity and the Social Crisis*, p. 167.)

"All the old essentials of pagan religion were reproduced in Christian form, but with scarcely a break in their essence: the effort to placate God by sacrifice, the amulets, cows, oracles, festivals, incense, candles, pictures, and statues. It was like a tropical jungle sprouting again after it is cut down." (p. 177.)

THE STATIONS.

The papal Roman "stations" of the Passion were copied from the pagan Roman army usage. (O. B. Frothingham, p. 178.)

FRIDAY FISH.

Those who consider it pious or proper to eat fish on Venus' day, or Friday, proclaim themselves, unconsciously, adherents of those heathen ideas which deified parts about which no one now likes to talk. (Inman's *Ancient Pagan and Modern Christian Symbolism*, p. 1. New York, 1884, J. W. Bouton.)

THE TIARA.

The papal tiara has not about it anything particularly Christian, a similar head-dress having been worn by gods or angels in ancient Assyria, where it appeared crowned by an emblem of "the trinity." All mention, in passing, that as the Romanists adopted the miter and the tiara from "the

cursed brood of Ham," so they adopted the episcopalian crook from the augurs of Etruria, and the artistic form with which they clothe their angels from the painters and urn-makers of Magna Graecia and Central Italy. (l. c., p. 64.)

THE PALLIUM.

The modern pallium worn by the Roman priest is the ancient sistrum of Isis or yoni of the Hindoos, symbolic of the celestial virgin. (l. c., p. 103.)

On head, shoulders, breast, and body we may see on Christian priests the relics of the worship of Venus and the adoration of woman! (l. c., p. 104.)

THE SACRED HEART.

Horus of Egypt, Vishnu of India, Bel of Babylon, were represented as carrying the sacred heart outside on the breast. Papal Rome does the same to-day with the "sacred heart" of Jesus. (Doane.)

THE AGNUS DEI.

The ancient pagans wore charms to drive away disease. Chrysostom complains that Antioch people bound brass coins of Alexander the Great about their heads to keep off or drive off disease.

The pagan Roman children carried around their necks a small ornament in the form of a heart, called *Bulla*. — The papal Roman children do the same. Cardinal Baronius says that those who have been baptized carry pendent from their necks an *Agnus Dei*, in imitation of a devotion of the pagans. (Doane, p. 405.)

FESTIVALS.

Gregory of Nyssa praised Gregory Thaumaturgus, Bishop of New Caesarea in Pontus, in 243, for changing the pagan festivals into Christian holidays, the better to draw the heathen to the religion of Christ. (Doane, p. 413.)

Dr. Draper, of the New York University, writes: "Crowds of worldly persons who cared nothing about its religious ideas, became its warmest supporters. Pagans at heart, their in-

fluence was soon manifested in the paganization of Christianity that forthwith ensued (under Constantine).

"The reign of Constantine marks the epoch of the transformation of Christianity from a religion into a political system. Paganism was modified by Christianity, Christianity by paganism.

Great is the difference between Christianity under Severus (born 146) and Christianity under Constantine (born 274). Many of the doctrines which at the latter period were preeminent, in the former were unknown. In accomplishing this amalgamation, Helen, the empress-mother, aided by the court ladies, led the way. As years passed on, the faith described by Tertullian (150—195) was transformed into one more fashionable and more debased. It was incorporated with the old Greek mythology. Olympus was restored, but the divinities passed under new names. Heathen rites were adopted. The festival of the Purification of Mary was invented to remove the uneasiness of heathen converts on account of the loss of their Lupercalia, or feasts of Pan. The apotheosis of the old Roman times was replaced by canonization; tutelary saints succeeded to local mythological divinities. Then came the mystery of transubstantiation, or the conversion of bread and wine by the priest into the flesh and blood of Christ. As centuries passed, the paganization became more and more complete.

The pagan Roman augur's chief ensign was the lituus; the papal Roman bishop's chief ensign is the same lituus, now called crozier.

At weddings it was the custom to sing hymns to Venus. (*Religion and Science*, pp. 30—49.)

O. B. Frothingham says: The papal Moses wears the horns of the pagan Jove. The papal Peter bears the keys of the pagan Janus. The statues of Jupiter, Apollo, Mercury, Orpheus did duty for the Christ. Ceres, Cybele, Demeter, assume new names as "Queen of Heaven," "Star of the Sea," "Maria Illuminatrix." Pluto and Proserpina resign their

seats in the hall of final judgment to the Christ and His mother. The *aura placida* of the poets, the gentle breeze, is personified as Aura and Placida. The *perpetua felicitas* is personified as St. Perpetua and St. Felicitas, guardian angels of the pious soul. Alb and chasuble recalled the fashions of Numa's day. The cast-off purple habits and shoes of pagan emperors beautified the august persons of Christian popes. The cardinals must be content with the robes once worn by senators. The pope thrust out his foot to be kissed, as Caligula, Heliogabalus, and Julius Caesar had thrust out theirs.

No relic of paganism was permitted to remain in its casket. A complete investigation of this subject will probably reveal the fact that Christianity [of course, the author means Roman Catholicism] owes its entire wardrobe, ecclesiastical, symbolical, dogmatical, to the religions that preceded it. (*Cradle of Christ*, pp. 178—181.)

Père Premere, a Jesuit missionary to China, was driven to conclude that the devil had practiced a trick on the Jesuits, so close was the resemblance of the Buddhist to his own religion. (Doane, p. 401.)

It is remarkable that a Christian church should have adopted so many pagan symbols as Rome has done. (Inman, p. 102.)

Renan writes: "Almost all our superstitions are the remains of a religion anterior to Christianity, and which Christianity has not been able entirely to root out." (*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 32.)

Much of the religion of the lower orders, which we regard as essentially *Christian*, is ancient *heathenism* refitted with Christian symbols. (Baring-Gould's *Curious Myths*, p. 426; in Doane, p. 397.)

Dr. Conyer Middleton writes: "In St. Agnes they showed me an antique statue of a young Bacchus, which, with a new name and some little change of drapery, stands now worshiped under the title of a female saint." (*Letters from Rome*, p. 84; in Doane, p. 398.)

Turretin says: "It was not so much the empire that was brought over to the faith as the faith that was brought over to the empire; not the pagans who were converted to Christianity, but Christianity that was converted to paganism." (Doane, p. 410.)

The object of the Reformation was to remove from Christianity the pagan ideas and pagan rites engrafted upon it by Constantine and his successors, in their attempts to reconcile the Roman empire to it. The Protestants designed to bring it back to its primitive purity; and hence, while restoring the ancient doctrines, they cast out of it all such practices as the adoration of the Virgin Mary and the invocation of the saints. (Dr. Draper, p. 298.)

Milwaukee, Wis.

W. DALLMANN.

For the benefit of those who would make a personal study of the subjects which Rev. Dallmann has discussed for some time in these pages, we append a bibliography which he has furnished:—

Lord Acton's *Quirinus*, Letters from Rome, 1870; *Lect. Mod. History*, 1906; *Histor. Essays*, 1907; *History of Freedom*, 1907; *Letters*; *Lord Acton and His Circle*.—*Anglican Brief*. London: Simpkin, 1893.—Wm. Arthur, *Pope, Kings, and People*. London.—Jno. A. Bain, *Devel. of R. C.*; *The New Reformation*.—Bezold, *Gesch. d. Reformation*.—Arthur Boethlingk, *Goethe u. d. kirchl. Rom*, 1902; *Schiller u. d. kirchl. Rom*, 1905.—W. E. Beet, *Rise of Papacy*. London, 1910.—Chas. Bigg, *The Church's Task under the Roman Empire*. Oxford, 1905.—Blatchford, *Church Councils and Their Decrees*. Boston, 1909.—Bright.—Brinkman's *Notes on Papal Claims*.—*Britannica*.—Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*.—Jacob Burckhardt, *Civil. of Renaiss. in Italy*. 2 vols.—W. R. Carson, *Reunion Essays*, 1903.—*Catholic Encyclopedia*.—H. S. Chamberlain, *Grundlagen des XIX. Jahrh.*; the English translation.—J. F. Clarke, *Events and Epochs in Rel. Hist.*—E. T. Colman, *The Pope*. Philadelphia, 1878.—Bishop Coxe, *Vat. Council*. Lippincott's, 1870.—Coquerel, *First Hist. Transformations of Christianity*.—Doellinger, *Janus*.—Dearden, *Mod. Romanism Examined*. 3d ed.; London, 1909.—*Deutsche Reichstagsakten unter Kaiser Karl V.* Bd. 3.—T. W. Doane, *Bible Myths*. New York.—J. W. Draper, *Religion and Science*.—Flick, *Rise of the Mediaeval Church*. Putnam's, 1909.—Forsyth, *Rome, Reform, and Reaction*.—O. B. Frothingham, *Cradle of Christ*. Putnam's, 1877.—Fradyssa, *R. C. Capitulating before Prot.* Mobile, 1908.—Froude, *Lect. on Trent*; *Lect. on Erasmus*.—Galton, *Our Attitude towards Engl. Rom. Catholics*. 2d ed.; London, 1902.—Gieseler, *Church History*.—Gladstone, *Rome*. Tauchnitz, 1875.—Bishop Gore, *R. C. Claims*. 9th ed., 1905.—Bishop Grafton, *Christian and Catholic; Pro-Romanism; A Correspondence; A Rejoinder*.—Gregorovius, *Rome in Mid. Ages*.—Gruppe, *Griech. Mythologie*, pp. 1651—1657.—Gwatkin, *Early Church History*. 1909.—*Handbuch d. deut. Geschichte*. Bd. II, 2. Aufl.—Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*. vol. 2, 1905.—Hase, *Handbook Controv. Rome*. R. T. S. 1906.—Hatch, *Infl. Greek Ideas*. Hibbert Lectures.

- Hauck, *Der Gedanke d. päpstlichen Weltherrschaft bis auf Bonifaz VIII.* Leipzig, 1904; *Deutschland u. d. päpstliche Weltherrschaft.* 1910. — Hisslop, *The Two Babylons.* 3d ed. — Hittel, *Papacy.* — Heyck, *Luther.* — Hobhouse, *Bampton Lect.* 1909. — Hoensbroech, *Papetum.* 2 vols.; Leipzig, 1906; *Rom u. d. Zentrum.* Leipzig, 1907; *Der Syllabus.* München, 1904; *Mod. Staat u. Roem. Kirche.* Berlin, 1906; *Zweck heiligt die Mittel.* Berlin, 1904. — *Ideas that have Influenced Civilization.* 10 vols. Milwaukee. — Inman, *Ancient Pagan and Modern Christian Symbolism.* New York, 1884. Isaacson, *Our Brief Against Rome.* R. T. S. 1905. — Joh. Janssen, *Geschichte.* — Kitts, *In the Days of the Councils; Pope John XXIII.* — Gust. Krueger, *The Papacy.* 1909. — Lea, *Hist. Celibacy.* 2d ed.; Boston, 1884; *Hist. Inquisition.* 3 vols.; New York, 1888; *Hist. Inquisition in Spain.* 4 vols. New York, 1906; *Formulary Papal Penitentiary in XIII. Century.* Philadelphia, 1892. — *Leo XIII's Encyclical Letters.* Benzinger Bros., New York, 1903. — *Letters to His Holiness Pope Pius X by a Modernist.* Chicago, 1910. — A. H. Lewis, *Paganism Surviving in Christianity.* Putnam's, 1892. — Littledale, *Petrine Claims.* 1889; *Plain Reasons.* 1905. — T. Livius, *St. Peter, Bishop of Rome.* London, 1888. — W. Lockett, *Judge Fairly.* London, 1910. — Gerh. Loeschke, *Jued. u. Heidn. im christl. Kult.* Bonn, 1910. — Loomis, *Great Conflict.* New York, 1874. — Macaulay, *History; Essays.* — McCabe, *Decay of Church of Rome.* — McCarthy, *Rome in Ireland.* London, 1904; *Five Years in Ireland.* Dublin; *Priest and People in Ireland.* Dublin, 1903. — M'Clintock and Strong, *Hauck R. E.* — Bishop Mellvaine, *Righteousness by Faith.* 3d ed. Philadelphia, 1868. — McKim, *Leo XIII at Bar of History.* Washington, D. C., 1897. — E. Garnet Man, *Papal Aims and Papal Claims.* Swan Sonnenschein. — H. K. Mann, *Lives Popes Early Middle Ages.* London, 1910. — Carl Mirbt, *Quellen z. Gesch. d. Papett.* — Neander, *Church History.* — Frederick Nielsen, *Hist. Papacy XIX. Century.* 2 vols.; London, 1906. — Fr. Nietzsche, *Der Antichrist.* — Nippold. — F. H. O'Donnell, *Paraguay on Shannon.* Dublin, 1908. — Oxenham, *Validity of Papal Claims.* — W. Preston, *Romanism Weighed.* London. — *Prot. Dictionary.* — *Protestants' Treasury.* London, 1910. — H. C. Pedder, *Shadow of Rome.* London, 1905. — Hans Preuss, *Der Antichrist.* Leipzig, 1906. — F. W. Puller, *Primitive Saints and See of Rome.* — Rainy, *Ancient Cath. Church.* — Emil Reich, *Select Documents.* London, 1905. — Reinkens, *Päpstliche Decrete.* — Renan, *Inst. Rome on Christianity.* Hibbert Lect., 1880. — J. H. Robinson, *Study Luth. Revolt.* Am. Hist. Review, Jan., 1903. — Alex. Robertson, *R. C. Church in Italy.* 5th ed.; London, 1905. — Ed. Rabaud, *Altheidnische Wurzeln im kath. Kultus.* 2. Aufl., 1906; Bertelsmann. — Em. Rhodis, *Pope Joan.* London, 1886. — Chas. Reade, *Cloister and Hearth.* — Canon Robertson, *Growth of the Papal Power.* S. P. C. K. — Salmon, *Infallibility of the Church.* 1899. — Schaff, *Church History.* — Schick, *Prot. Antwoort Pius IX.* Erlangen, 1869; Deichert. — Philip Sidney, *Modern Rome in Modern England.* R. T. S., 1906. — Simpson, *R. C. Opposition to Papal Infallibility.* 1909. — Stearns, *Faith of Our Forefathers.* 9th ed., New York. — I. Taylor, *Ancient Christianity.* — Cardinal Merry del Val, *Truth of Papal Claims.* — Vaughan, *Medici Popes.* 1908. — Jos. S. Van Dyke, *Popery.* Philadelphia, 1871. — R. E. Welsh, *People and Priest.* 3d ed.; London, 1902. — Wetzler und Welte, *Kirchenlexikon.* — B. Willard Archer, *Characteristics of the Roman Church.* London. — K. Wieland, *Deutsche Abrechnung mit Rom.* 1911. — Wilkins, *Paganism in Papal Church.* 1901. Swan Sonnenschein. — Wissowa, *Rel. u. Kultur d. Roemer.* — A. D. White, *Seven Great Statesmen.* 1910. — Adolf Wrede, *Die Beschwerden d. deut. Nation.* Nuernberg, Febr., 1523. — J. A. Wylie, *The Papacy.* London, 1876. — *Words of Help.* Am. Tract Soc. — Baroness von Zedwitz, *Double Doctrine of Rome.* Revell.

THE PROOF TEXTS OF THE CATECHISM WITH A PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.

THE SECOND ARTICLE.

(Continued.)

CHRIST'S SITTING AT THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD.

Ps. 110, 1: *The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit Thou at my right hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool.*

The *right hand* of God, what is it? God is a spirit, hence has neither a right hand nor a left hand. The expression is an anthropomorphism. What does it signify? To the people of Israel, Moses said: "And thou shalt remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and Jehovah, thy God, brought thee out thence by a *mighty hand* and by an *out-stretched arm*," Deut. 5, 15. Clearly God's *hand* and *arm* here indicate His great *power*. "Thou hast a mighty arm," says the Psalmist; "*strong* is Thy *hand*, and *high* is Thy *right hand*," Ps. 89, 13. Obviously again, *hand*, *right hand*, bespeaks God's almighty power. Hence in the trial before the Sanhedrin, Jesus, speaking of His exaltation, says: "Henceforth ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the *right hand of power*."

As the expression "right hand of God" is figurative, so is the phrase: "*sitting* at the right hand of God." What does it mean? The mother of the sons of Zebedee asks Jesus: "Command that these my two sons may sit one on Thy right hand and one on Thy left hand, in Thy kingdom," Matt. 20, 21. Jesus understands this request as meaning that the sons should be allowed to *share in the rule* of His kingdom; cf. v. 25. The locution: to sit at the right hand of a ruler, therefore, conveys the idea of *participating in the rule*.

Now as to our text. Ps. 110 is a Messianic psalm. This we have on no less an authority than Christ's Himself. One day, when the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus propounded the question, "What think ye of Christ? Whose Son is He?" They answered, "The *Son of David*." Then

followed the perplexing question, "How, then, doth David in Spirit call Him *Lord*, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord," etc., Matt. 22, 41 ff. David's Lord is none other than Christ. Christ, the Messiah, is true God and true man in one person. This the blind Pharisees could not see. Cf. also Mark 12, 35 ff.; Luke 20, 41 ff.; 1 Cor. 15, 25; Hebr. 1, 13.

David begins his comforting psalm thus: "*The Lord* (the Father) *said unto my Lord* (Christ)." Two persons are here discriminated: the speaker and the one spoken to; but both are called "Lord." The Father is Lord; Christ is Lord. Christ is equal with the Father; Christ is God. But David's Lord is also David's son, true man. As the God-man He had been sent forth to redeem them that were under the Law. Even in this state of humiliation David's son was "God over all," Rom. 9, 5, "the Mighty God," Is. 9, 6, "our great God," Tit. 2, 13. But in that state the Messiah did not constantly use the divine majesty communicated to His human nature. David "in Spirit," i. e., by divine inspiration, sees the work of redemption completed, sees the state of humiliation of his son come to an end. Now the Father says to David's son: "*Sit Thou at my right hand*," i. e., share in my rule; rule with me with divine power and majesty. God exalted the man Christ. According to Christ's divine nature, He could not be exalted; in reference to it the Father could not and would not say: "*Sit at my right hand*." The very word "sit" indicates that these words were said to Him according to His human nature. Now, in the state of exaltation, Christ, *also according to His human nature*, rules all things with divine power and majesty. That is the significance of His *sessio ad dexteram*. Hence we read in v. 2: "Rule Thou (Christ) in the midst of Thine enemies," which enemies are made His "footstool," v. 1.

Eph. 1, 20—23: *God set Him (Christ) at His own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him*

to be the Head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all.

The paragraph, Eph. 1, 15—23, of which the foregoing text forms the close, contains a supplication of St. Paul for the Christians at Ephesus. It is replete with consolation and encouragement for the Christians and the Christian Church. Our text speaks of the Church, of its security. We often tremble for its welfare. We observe the high winds and the angry waves of adversity coming threateningly upon the ship of the Church, and forget the nearness of the Lord. A thorough knowledge of what this means: Christ sits at the right hand of God, and a childlike faith in that truth, will dispel our fears. Instead of crying out in consternation with the disciples on the tempest-tossed Galilean sea: "Lord, save; we perish!" we will become emboldened triumphantly and defiantly to challenge all adversaries with Paul: "If God be for us, who can be against us?" Rom. 8, 31.

St. Paul prays God that the Ephesian Christians may have the eyes of their heart enlightened so that they may know, among other things, also this, what is the power of Him who sitteth at the right hand of God, and what is His relation to the Church.

"God set Him (Christ) at His own right hand." God's right hand is the hand of *His power* (Matt. 24, 64), the right hand of *His majesty* (Hebr. 1, 3). Here God *set* Christ. Christ is God, and the divine government belonged to Him from all eternity. According to His divine nature, Christ could not be said to be *set* at God's right hand. The very word "*set*" indicates that this was done according to His *human* nature. The context, too, speaks of Him that was raised from the dead, v. 20a, of the man Christ. The man Christ was exalted to an unceasing participation in the divine government. (See exposition of Ps. 110, 1.) *"In heavenly places."* This phrase does not denote a certain locality, which, by the way, would militate against God's spirituality and would

disrupt the natures in Christ, but it designates the sphere of majesty and glory in which our Lord and God lives and reigns. In the succeeding phrases and clauses the meaning of that grand thought: "Christ sits at the right hand of God in heavenly places," is most sublimely unfolded. In virtue of this participation in the divine government, Christ is "*far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion.*" "That these names denote angels, angels of light, is now most generally acknowledged, likewise also, that these synonymous designations do not point to an order or rank within the *hierarchia coelestis* . . . , but to the superhuman power and might of the heavenly spirits." (Stoeckhardt.) Observe the polysyndeton: "*principality and power and might and dominion.*" That serves to make the thought emphatic. The reader is invited to ponder each concept separately in order to become all the more impressed with the marvelous power of these holy angels. However powerful they may be, aye, though all their power and might be combined, yet there is one who possesses far greater power; for "*far above*" them all is He that sits at the right hand of God, Christ, and majestically rules over them. Christ, our Brother, is on the throne of majesty. "Why, then, are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?"

The circle of Christ's dominion widens: He is far above "*every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.*" That says: Christ rules over all, whatever it may be, howsoever great and powerful it may be, wherever it may be found, here in time or in eternity. Let the heathen rage and the kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord and against His Anointed—no power on earth can shake His throne.—And as if to round off his majestic thought and guard against all misconception as to what the rule of Christ, who is at the right hand of God, comprises, the apostle sweepingly asserts: "*and hath put*" in subjection, lastingly, permanently, "*all things under His feet,*" so that Christ exercises absolute sovereignty over *all things*, all creatures whatsoever, the very

devils in hell not excepted. Heaven, earth, hell—all under His feet! What a mighty Ruler this man Christ is! And this God-man is our Savior. What a sweet consolation! In the days of His flesh He said: "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth." He proved His assertion to be true. He rebuked the winds and the waves, and there was a great calm. He cast out evil spirits with His word. The leper is cleansed of his leprosy; the centurion's petition in behalf of his dying servant is answered. The young man at Nain is called to life; at His word, Lazarus comes from the grave. Rays of divine glory these—in the state of humiliation. Now He, the glorified Christ, is in the state of exaltation, and now He has come into the unceasing use, also according to His human nature, of the divine majesty that was always His. And He is the same Savior to-day that He was then, with the same merciful heart. Will He not guard and protect us and His Church against all enemies?

But the majestic thought of the apostle reaches its climax in the last clause: "*and gave Him to be the Head over all things to the Church, which is His body.*" In this translation the peculiar emphasis imparted by the Greek to the pronoun "Him" is lost. The original reads: *καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκε κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἥτις ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ* = "and *Him* He gave as Head over all things to the Church, which is His body." Him—this glorious majestic Ruler just described; Him—who is equal with God; Him—to whom all, heaven, earth, and hell, is made subject: *Him God gave as Head to the Church, i. e., the communion of saints, which—Church—is His body.* He that is Head over all things as Ruler and Sovereign, Col. 2, 10, is at the same time the Head of the Church. But the headship, the rule, over the Church is entirely different from His headship over all creatures. In the kingdom of power He rules by means of His omnipotence; in the kingdom of grace He rules with His gracious Word. In the true sense of the word, as head that possesses a body, Christ is Head of His Church only, Col. 1, 18. The unbe-

lievers are not members of His spiritual body. "If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His," Rom. 8, 9. How great the dignity of the Church: Christ is the Head; the believers are the members of this spiritual body. As intimately as the head is connected with the body, so intimately is Christ connected with the Church. As the head governs the body, so this Head governs His body, the Church. The Church hears the Word of Truth, the Gospel of salvation, v. 13. That is Christ's voice; by it the body, the Church, is governed. Whatsoever the Head, Christ, wills, the body, the Church, executes. "One is your Master, even Christ."

But another incomparable prerogative of the Church comes out in the last phrase: the Church is "*the fullness of Him that filleth all in all.*" *Πλήρωμα* = fullness, is a rare expression. The preponderance of usage gives it the meaning "that which fills," not "that which is filled;" not the receptacle, but that which fills the receptacle. (See Stoeckhardt, *Epheserbrief.*) So the text says: The Church is "*the fullness of Him,*" i. e., the fullness of Christ; the Church is in full possession of the gifts of Christ. From Him, the exalted Head, the plenitude of spiritual, heavenly blessings are communicated to His body, the Church. — Note the distinction clearly marked in the text: the Church is "*the fullness of Him that filleth all in all.*" He that is *far above* all things also *fills all things.* — In passing we remark that the context speaks of Christ who died and rose again; hence the omnipresence of Christ's human nature finds expression here. Col. 1, 17. — The text says: He *that filleth all in all* = all things, also fills the Church. Christ fills all things with His efficacious presence, and from this omnipresence flows His special gracious presence with His Church.

And now, let us again ponder the emphasis in the clause: "And *Him* He gave as Head over all things to the Church, which is His body." What does this unmistakably peculiar stress say? He that is so intimately connected with His Church, He that has given His heart's blood for it as the

purchase price, He is at the same time the Ruler of the universe—heaven, earth, and hell being made subject to Him, *and He will, therefore, rule and govern all things for the benefit of the Church.* True, “now we see not yet all things put under His feet,” Hebr. 2, 8; it is an article of faith. Though now we do not see all things put under His feet, yet the fact remains. The whole course of this world is shaped for the benefit of the Church. When a building is completed, the scaffold is taken away. When the last elect has been gathered into the fold, or, to change the figure, when the last stone has been placed in God’s temple, the Church, Eph. 2, 19 ff., the scaffold of this world will be destroyed. So the whole world still stands to-day for the benefit of the Church.—When, at the time of Christ, the then known world was brought under one rule—that of the Roman emperor—highroads were built connecting the entire vast domain, commerce was established along these routes, intercourse was made comparatively easy, one language was understood by all—the Greek. These self-same means of communication the apostles used. Along these highroads they traveled, publishing the Gospel of the Kingdom in Greek, thus building the Church.—About the time of the Reformation, the invention of printing books by movable type was made—for the benefit of the Church. The Bible, Luther’s translation, could be easily and cheaply procured, and the Gospel could be widely spread. And the discovery of America—we see it *a posteriori*—was for the benefit of the Church. Here, under the providence of God, the principle of separation of Church and State became an established fact—for the benefit of the Church. Just now there are dark clouds looming up on the horizon. The elevation of three archbishops of the Catholic hierarchy to the cardinalate forebodes nothing good, neither for the Church nor for the State. But Christ sits at the right hand of God and is the Head of the Church. This is our consolation.—Even the persecutions of the Church, in the last analysis, served for the benefit of the Church. (Acts 17, 1 ff.)

In yonder life, when the mists will have lifted and our vision will have become clear, we shall see that this whole universe, the governments, the rulers, "every name that is named," lay in the hollow of His hand who sitteth at the right hand of the Father, and that all and everything was made subservient to the building of His kingdom, the Church.

CHRIST'S RETURN TO JUDGMENT.

Acts 1, 11: *This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven.*

To His disciples Christ "showed Himself alive after His passion by many infallible proofs, *being seen of them forty days*, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God," Acts 1, 3. At the completion of these forty days His ascension took place from Mount Olivet, v. 12, about two miles distant from Jerusalem. The narrative lays all stress upon the fact that Christ's ascension was a *visible* ascension and not a sudden disappearance. "And when He had spoken these things, *while they beheld*, He was taken up," v. 9. In full view of the disciples He went up gradually, and as He did so, He blessed them, Luke 24, 50. 51. He ascended higher and higher until "a cloud received Him out of their sight," v. 9. The disciples "looked steadfastly toward heaven as He went up," v. 10; they "gazed up into heaven," v. 11, following Him with their eager eyes with mixed feelings of rapt astonishment and saddened hearts. — Whither He went, the "two men that stood by them in white apparel," angels in human form, told them: "He is taken up from you into heaven," v. 11. Thus all stress is laid upon His *visible* ascension. His *visible* presence they should no longer enjoy, though *invisibly* He, the God-man, was always with them as He is still with us, according to His promise: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them," Matt. 18, 20, and: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," Matt. 28, 20. — But there will be a time when

He will return *visibly*. For so say these "two men": "*This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven.*" As in the preceding verses we have a studied account of His *visible* ascension, so we have here a studied declaration of His *visible* return. — Who will return? *Ὁυτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς*. *This Jesus, this same Jesus* who was born in Bethlehem, who suffered, was crucified and died; the same Jesus who was raised again on the third day, who was seen by them for forty days after His resurrection; the same Jesus who had just spoken to them the things pertaining to the kingdom of God, and who now visibly departed from them, this same Jesus, God's Son and Mary's son, shall come again. How? He "shall so come," visibly, *in like manner as ye have seen Him go,*" visibly, gloriously, "into heaven." Cf. Matt. 26, 64; 24, 30; Rev. 1, 7; Matt. 25, 32.

For what purpose He will return we are told in

Acts 10, 42: *He (Christ) is ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead.*

Christ's own words furnish a commentary to this passage. To the Jews He had said: "For the Father judgeth no ~~man~~," immediately, "but hath committed all judgment unto the Son," John 5, 25, "and hath given Him authority to execute judgment also, because He is the Son of man," v. 27.

Acts 17, 31: *God hath appointed a day in the which He will judge the world in righteousness by that Man whom He hath ordained.*

This text is taken from St. Paul's speech at Athens on The Unknown God. — The following obvious points may be noted: 1. The certainty of Judgment Day. "God hath appointed a *day*" of judgment. And not only has a certain, definite *day* been decreed in the eternal counsels of God, but also the very *hour* in which the judgment is to take place. See Matt. 24, 36. 42 and Mark 13, 32: "that *day*," "that *hour*." This day is called "the last day," John 12, 48; "the

day of the Lord," 2 Pet. 3, 10, *et al.* — 2. Christ will be the Judge. "He (God) will judge . . . by that Man whom He hath ordained," i. e., Christ. (Cf. Acts 10, 42; Matt. 25, 31.) — 3. It will be a judgment of the whole world. "He will judge the *world*," the "quick and dead," Acts 10, 42; "all nations," Matt. 25, 32; "all," 2 Cor. 5, 10. — 4. It will be a righteous judgment. "He will judge . . . in righteousness." St. Paul calls Judgment Day "the day of wrath and revelation of the *righteous judgment* (*δικαιοκρισίας*) of God," Rom. 2, 5. In this judgment there will be "no respect of persons with God," Rom. 2, 11; 1 Pet. 1, 17.

2 Pet. 3, 10: *But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up.*

Speaking of "the day of the Lord," St. Peter directs our attention to three things: 1. The certainty of its coming; 2. the manner of its coming; 3. the terrors attending that day.

"Ἡξεῖ δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα = "Come will, however, the day." The verb ἦξεῖ = "come will" is very emphatic, being placed at the head of the sentence, thus calling attention to the absolute certainty of this event. Why this stress? Because "there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of His coming? For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of creation," vv. 3. 4. "All things continue" — that was the argument of the scoffers in Peter's days. Though Peter in the succeeding verses, in masterful fashion, has put the quietus on the cavilings of these despicable lustful fellows, the cry to-day remains the same: "All things continue!" In stentorian voice the watchmen on Zion's walls, therefore, must call out again and again: "Come will the day!" Do not lull yourselves into security. The promise of His coming will not fall to the ground; *come will the day!* — This day will come "*as a thief in the night.*" The point of comparison is the

sudden, unexpected advent. (Cf. Matt. 24, 27. 43; 1 Thess. 5, 2; Rev. 3, 3; 16, 15.) As a thief steals upon men at an hour when they least expect it, so "this day" will come suddenly, unexpectedly, and find most men wrapped in spiritual sleep. — When this day will come, what will happen? "*The heavens shall pass away with a great noise.*" "All things continue," say the scoffers; "the heavens shall pass away," says Peter. "To describe the dread process, he has a striking word, which, like so many of the Apostle's expressions, is used nowhere else in the New Testament, 'With a great noise,' *βοῤηθόου*. It is applied to many signs of terror: to the hurtling of weapons as they fly through the air; to the sound of a lash as it is brought down for the blow; to the rushing of waters; to the hissing of serpents. He has chosen it as if by it he would unite many horrors into one." (Lumby.) Next follows the thought of nature's dissolution: "*the elements shall melt with fervent heat.*" "Elements," *στορυεῖα*, is a difficult concept. Some commentators believe that, since "elements" are mentioned after "the heavens," the sun, the moon, and the stars are designated by that word; others again — Luther, Wahl, *et al.* — understand *στορυεῖα* to mean the *component materials* of the world. These will "melt," be dissolved, by that fervent heat. "*The earth also and the works that are therein,*" works of nature, of art, of science, etc., "*shall be burned up.*" An irresistible fire, indeed! — The text is a warning against carnal security. "Let your loins be girded about, and your lamps burning, and ye yourselves like unto men looking for their lord," Luke 12, 35.

Mark 13, 32: *Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.*

What is the precise time of Christ's coming? It is a profound mystery. Observe the climax! No *man* knows, not even the *holy angels* know, yea, not even the *Son*, during the state of humiliation according to His human nature, knew of "that day and that hour." — What is the lesson contained

herein for us? The Lord Himself gives it: "Take ye heed, *watch and pray*; for ye know not when the time is," v. 33. "*Watch* therefore," v. 35. "And what I say unto you I say unto all, *Watch!*" v. 36.—*Notes*: 1. How futile and foolish are the attempts of those wiseacres who, with pencil and pad in hand, endeavor to compute "that day and that hour." 2. Of Christ, the God-man, we read, Matt. 9, 4: Jesus *knew* their *thoughts*; John says (2, 25): "He needed not that any one should bear witness concerning man; for He Himself *knew what was in man.*" Christ is omniscient. Now if the question be asked, How is it possible that not even the Son in the state of humiliation knew of "that hour"? we answer, We don't know. It is a mystery. Scripture, the Son of God Himself, states it as a fact; by that we abide.

1 Pet. 4, 7: *The end of all things is at hand.*

These words were written well-nigh two thousand years ago. Was it a mistaken utterance? St. Paul admonishes the Philippians: "The Lord is at hand," Phil. 4, 5. St. John beseechingly warns the Christians: "Little children, it is the last hour," 1 John 2, 18. Have Peter, Paul, and John erred? Let Dr. Walther answer: "We durst not imagine that the holy apostles have erred here; they cried out: 'The Lord is at hand!' and still they knew full well that millenniums might pass before the Lord's return. For example, when St. Peter had spoken of the nearness of Christ's Second Advent, he added: 'But be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.' And St. Paul, after proclaiming the nearness of the last day, nevertheless adds: 'Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition.' But . . . why, notwithstanding, could the apostles speak so clearly concerning the nearness of the end of the world? Because they did not speak man's language, but God's language; before God the end is *at hand* even though millenniums must still pass by." (*Ep. Post.*, p. 255.)

2 Cor. 5, 10: *We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.*

"We must all," none excepted, "appear," rather, "*be manifested, be made manifest,*" appear in our true character, before the judgment-seat of Christ. Why? In the sight of God we all are at all times manifest; He need not institute this judgment for His sake to find out where we stand. In that great panorama of the Last Day unrolled before our eyes in Matt. 25, the separation between the sheep and the goats is made *before* the sentence is pronounced. This judgment is to be a public judgment to vindicate God's righteousness, to prove that "He judgeth the world in righteousness," Acts 17, 31. Unerring justice will be meted out on that day. The very damned themselves, conscience-smitten, must concede: My damnation is just. — How will that be effected? The judgment will be based upon the works of man, "*according to that he hath done, whether good or bad.*" "God will render to every man *according to his deeds,*" Rom. 2, 6. God, "without respect of persons, judgeth *according to every man's work,*" 1 Pet. 1, 17. The outward semblance of having been Christians will not save; hypocrisy will be no cloak here. The works are manifest proofs of man's sentiment, whether he was for Christ or against Christ. The good works of the believers will be produced in evidence of their faith; the evil works of the unbelievers, in evidence of their unbelief. Thus the doctrine: Through grace by faith in Christ are ye saved, is not subverted, does not clash with this or similar passages. — But will the evil works of Christians also be brought to light on that great day? No. In that sublime account of the final judgment, Matt. 25, the Lord speaks of the *good* works only of those on His right hand, thus proving their relation to Him, showing that their faith bore fruits. (See Ezek. 33, 13; Is. 43, 25; Jer. 31, 34; Hebr. 10, 17; Is. 38, 17.) — In passing, may it be said that these good works of the Christians

are in no way to be looked upon as being meritorious. Before praising the good works of those on His right, the Lord does not say: "Come, for ye have *merited* the kingdom," but His words are: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, *inherit* the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world," Matt. 25, 34. So, then, the good works of the children of God are considered only as fruits and proofs of faith which can be recognized also by men. "In this the children of God *are manifest*, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother," 1 John 3, 10.

John 12, 48: *The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day.*

This is the rule of judgment: Christ's Word. This same Word that we now hear, read, study, this same Word "shall judge him" who despises Christ "in the last day." What is that rule stated in other words? "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned," Mark 16, 16. Or, to quote another passage: "He that believeth on Him (Christ) is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only-begotten Son of God," John 3, 18.

Springfield, Ill.

LOUIS WESSEL.

(To be continued.)

CURRENT EVENTS.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY (vol. 42, p. 138) says of the series of articles on the "Proof Texts of the Catechism" which we have been publishing for some time: "As a practical exposition this commentary is hard to excel. We hope it will appear in book form." The same reviewer is also favorably impressed with the articles on "Romanism a Plagiarism on Paganism."

A *ST. LOUIS DAILY* quotes from a published statement of Lutheran ministers regarding the Men and Religion Forward Movement as follows:—

"We cannot understand why any thinking man cannot realize the seriousness of conditions. The case is plain and simple enough if duly considered. If, for instance, the doctrine of the apostolic succession of the Episcopal Church is Scriptural, then we preachers who have not been ordained by an Episcopalian bishop have no right whatever to be and remain incumbents of the holy office of the ministry. If the doctrine of immersion, so tenaciously held by the Baptist Church, is Scriptural, then all we who have not been immersed are not baptized. If the doctrine of an election to eternal damnation, taught by the Calvinists, is Scriptural, then we are deceiving the people by preaching that Jesus died for all sinners, and that God will have all men to be saved."

The paper goes on to say: "The Lutheran belief in the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures and in the doctrine that the body and blood of Christ are present and orally partaken of in the Sacrament by all communicants is emphasized."

The document of the Lutheran ministers is quoted once more, to this effect: "That these and many similar differences should not be worthy of recognition and of the most prayerful and careful consideration on the part of all Christians and lovers of the truth and their Lord, and sufficient ground to preclude cooperation of these among whom these differences exist, and until they no longer exist, is difficult to be understood by all such as have learned the Word of Truth and have learned to stand for a definite theology on the basis of such Word of Truth, it being the unerring inspired Word of God."

The Lutheran document was prepared by our brethren of the Long Island Pastoral Conference and was addressed to the Committee of One Hundred representing the Men and Religion Forward Movement, and has made a favorable impression, because, "while clearly showing doctrinal differences between Lutherans and those denominations promoting this movement, it is courteously worded," and asks to be considered "in the same Christian and charitable spirit in which it is written."

REV. O. WISMAR, of New Orleans, and *Rev. A. Kaub*, of Dallas, have been compelled to meet the false claims of Romanists in the daily press of their respective cities. The character of the strife was as usual: Truth and plain facts on our side, equivocation and distortion of facts on the other side. Rome is plainly bent on rewriting the history of the world and the Church in its own interest. It is "making history" in our country in more than one sense.

REV. RUHLAND, of Ottawa, Can., sends us press reports regarding the *Ne Temere* decree, as follows:—

"Quebec, January 23.—The marriage question appeared again in the Provincial Legislature at yesterday afternoon's sitting, when Hon. Jeremie Decarie, Provincial Secretary, replied to several questions that had been put by Mr. Godfrey Langlois.

"Hon. Mr. Decarie said that the decree of the Council of Trent respecting marriage had been promulgated in this province in 1700 by Mgr. St. Valier, and that the Government had not considered the desirability of legislation legalizing marriages contracted by two Catholics before a Protestant minister.

"Mr. Langlois' query read: 'Is it the Government's intention to amend the civil code so as henceforth to render valid any marriage between two contracting parties belonging to different religious creeds or to the same creed when celebrated before any officer duly qualified to celebrate marriage?'

"The reply of the Government was that the matter had not been considered."

Still the Roman Church has lost one case in court which affects the *Ne Temere* decree. The famous Hebert marriage had been annulled by Justice Larendeau, after Archbishop Bruchesi of Montreal had published the pope's decree. Later, Justice Charbonneau declared the "marriage valid in the eyes of the civil law." The decision of the justice plainly deprecates interference on the part of Rome with the civil rights of persons. This drew a reply from the Archbishop of Montreal, on February 26, who said, in part:—

"The agitation carried on from one end of our country to the other, the more or less violent articles appearing in several Protestant newspapers against the wise and beneficent, yet evidently ill-understood, legislation of the Catholic Church, and the deductions gathered from a recent judgment of the civil courts, impose upon me the duty to raise my voice, not for the purpose of trying to interpret the text of human laws, but in order to solemnly affirm the ever immutable principles of our faith touching the august sacrament of marriage as well as the sacred legislation of the Church which neither jurists' thesis nor the findings of civil tribunals can ever abrogate or modify. . . .

"Marriage, like all other sacraments, belongs to the Church, and consequently it belongs to the Church to direct everything that concerns the validity of marriage. Such was the doctrine of the Catholic Church before the Protestant Reformation, and such will it be in all time. If, however, our separate brethren have rejected it, if they have made marriage a simple contract submitted, like all others, to

the civil powers, which may dissolve or govern at its will, let them at least allow us to remain faithful to our secular traditions, and in the name of that liberty which they claim for themselves let them permit us to act according to the convictions of our faith.

"Whatever happens, the holy laws of the Church on the marriage question will always continue to bind the conscience of its children, *and these alone*, in the eyes of the Church, *will be worthy of the title of husband and wife who will have contracted a marriage according to her forms and rulings.*"

On the same day, Bishop Fallon of St. Thomas was foolish enough to utter the following:—

"What have we done to deserve these attacks? Why are we pilloried in the press? Are we not of the same flesh and blood as non-Catholics? What have we done? *Only what Christ had done when they cried, 'Crucify Him!' and what the first Christians had done when they said: 'The Christians to the lions!'* Catholics are used to these attacks, but I am getting sick and tired, and I want to take this opportunity of protesting.

"The *Ne Temere* decree is an arrangement *purely* for the Catholic people, affecting their conscience, and *having no more to do with the civil law than the man in the moon.*"

We might call this a "retreat with flying colors," but it is a retreat—until a more convenient season for an advance shall have arrived.

Just as this issue is going to press, the announcement is being made that the pope is preparing a letter repealing the *Ne Temere* decree.

AUGUSTANA editorially attacks the claim that a pastor must be guided by popular opinion. It says: "Folkets röst är Guds röst (i. e., *vox populi, vox Dei*), this saying is one of the tallest lies which 'the father of lies' has uttered in this world." The article goes on to show what this saying, taken seriously, meant in the days of the French Revolution. It points out the unpopular position occupied by Noah in his age, by Moses in Egypt and in the desert, by Elijah over and against the Baal-worshippers, by the ancient prophets who invariably represented the minority in their day, by John Baptist, by the Lord, whom a popular decision rejected for Barabbas, etc. Yes, the voice of the people is not the voice of God, *except when God's people repeat what God has spoken.* The pastor surely misses his calling who sets out to be popular, except with the children of God. According to Matt. 5, 12, it is a blessed thing when a pastor is reviled and evil spoken of *for Christ's sake.*—On the other hand, 1 Tim. 3, 2 requires of the pastor that he be *ἀσπυτος*,

which Wilke renders "*bene compositus, decorus, modestus.*" *Κόσμιος* does not mean "worldly," and, in that sense, popular. Bishop Herrey paraphrased it: "with a due proportion in his life, modest in deportment, courteous to all, of a calm temper and grave demeanor." A circumspect walk, a good report among them that are without,—these are the Scriptural limits to pastoral aspirations for popularity. These can be gained, by the grace of the Lord, by the humblest pastor, and they necessitate no sacrifice of principle or consistency. But any popularity purchased at a moral sacrifice is a burden to the conscience, and, in addition, a poor bargain, even from a worldly point of view; for popular favor is an ephemeral thing, a breath, a vapor. Even Cicero and Virgil understood the worthlessness of the "*aurae populares.*"

THE PRESBYTERIANS OF ATLANTA, GA., are making an effort to secure for their city the simultaneous meeting of the four Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church in 1913. *The Presbyterian* scouts the idea "that the movers in the matter had designs toward organic union," but has no objection if a union can be effected. "The evil to be avoided is trickery and any manner of force. If everything is ripe for it, let there be a union; if not, let there be none." All of which suggests the lines of the German poet: "Ich ging im Walde so für mich hin, und nichts zu suchen, das war mein Sinn," etc. Accidents will happen. It is just possible that these four Presbyterian bodies, *happening* to meet in the same place, without any design, may *happen* to unite. And that will be the "trickery" of it. Aye, aye, there is much "trickery," little religiousness, in modern union movements.

PROF. MILTON S. TERRY, in his "Biblical Dogmatics" (p. 8), scorns Quenstedt's and Carpzov's presentation of the divine impulse by which the Scriptures came to be written. He says: "Along with the old rabbinic and allegorical exegesis, there was also begotten a theory of Biblical inspiration which in course of time has taken to itself such qualifying terms as *verbal, inerrant, and infallible*. It has affirmed that the sacred writers were impassive instruments in the hands of God, and that every word and letter of the Bible were supernaturally dictated by the omniscient Spirit. Thus Quenstedt, in 1685, declared that 'all things which were to be written were suggested by the Holy Spirit to the sacred writers in the very act of writing, and were dictated to their intellect as if unto a pen (*quasi in calamus*), so that they could be written in no other circumstances, in this and no other mode or order' (*Theologia Didact.*, IV, 2). Carpzov, in 1728, declared that the divine Power

'impelled the will' of the Biblical writers, and 'directed their hands that they might write infallibly' (*Critica Sacra Vet. Test.*, p. 43)."

This is a fair specimen of the superficial work of modern scientific theology. Note the nonchalant way of giving references: "Theologia Didact." is amusing; "IV, 2" is hilarious. The words to which Prof. Terry refers are in Part I, cap. IV, Sect. II, quæst. 3 in the thesis, page 68 of the Wittenberg edition of 1685. Note also the scholarly rendering of the common Latin phrase "*in calamum dictitare*." Remember, lastly, that Quenstedt's treatise, *De Scriptura Sacra*, runs through nearly 200 pages folio closely printed (pp. 53—240), and that it is one of the most searching studies extant on what the Bible says in plain words, or reveals by unavoidable inference, regarding its origin,—and you have an idea of the "scientific" outrage perpetrated by the above quotation. And now, try to fathom the possible connection between Quenstedt's presentation of the theopneusty and "the old rabbinical and allegorical exegesis."—Possibly, Prof. Terry's citation was obtained at second hand. We do not suspect him of having read Quenstedt or Carpzov.

PROF. NICHOLAUS M. STEFFENS in *The Christian Intelligencer* discusses the question, "Is Christianity a Syncretistic Religion?" and refers to the interesting derivation of the term "syncretism," whether it is to be traced to a verb *συνκρητίζω*, "to do as the Cretans do," or to *συνκράννυμι*, "to commingle." He says:

"What was the original meaning of syncretism? Plutarch tells us that syncretisize means to act under certain circumstances as the Cretans did. When Cretans quarreled among themselves, which frequently was the case, and a third party tried to interfere, they united and fought against the intruder.

"In the history of the Church we find that the term was applied to union movements, which were a result of the threatening disintegration of the Church and the resulting loss of its visible unity.

"In the formative period of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, when many earnest men deplored the breaking up of the visible unity of the Church of Christ, syncretistic movements were the order of the day. Some optimistic lovers of Church unity, *e. g.*, the theologian Calixtus and the philosopher Leibnitz, did not despair of a reunion of Roman Catholics and Protestants. Melancthon, perhaps, is the model of this kind of syncretism, for he was even willing to submit to the pope and his hierarchy if Protestants were permitted to preach the doctrine of justification by faith only.

"Later, however, during the time of the fierce dogmatic controversies between Lutheran and Reformed theologians, syncretism

was not in favor. The great champions of Neo-Scholasticism denounced all attempts to unite the two branches of the Protestant Church. According to their idea of syncretism a union between the Reformed and the Lutheran Churches would necessarily result in a mixture of heterogeneous elements. They even went so far as to derive the term syncretism from a Greek verb which means to mix. The Evangelical unionists of our day, however, cling to the original meaning of the term, a little modified perhaps, desirous as they are to enlist all the Christian forces against the common enemy.

"It does not enter their minds to look upon Christianity as a syncretistic religion. Is it not strange that the orthodox teachers of the Neo-Scholastic period and the radical propagandists of the so-called new theology of our own time should hold the same view of syncretism? Truly, extremes meet. But the old teachers would never have consented that Christianity pure and simple has to be looked upon as a syncretistic religion. They objected to a mixture of different tendencies of Christianity because they believed that they had found in their system the correct conception of Christianity; hence they feared an adulteration of the genuine article by an admixture of less valuable materials. The new theologians, however, have no scruples of this kind."

The history of the term, with the documentary evidence, is given in the Henke-Wagemann articles of *Protestantische Real-Encyklopaedie*. Regardless of the derivation, the preponderance of modern usage has assigned to syncretism a meaning synonymous with unionism, indifferentism, agree-to-disagree policy. This, of course, favors the derivation from *συνεσάρρευμι*, and it is a question whether those who accept this derivation ought not to write syncratism instead of syncretism. The *Standard Dictionary* still derives the term from *συνκρητισμ*.

Prof Steffens, in the article aforementioned, has some pertinent remarks and criticisms on the syncretistic tendency of the new theology.

"They maintain that Christianity is not a pure and simple religion as we have thought, but a mixture of many religious elements taken from all the religions of the world, and they are of the opinion that even in our day Christian theologians ought to be willing to learn and to assimilate much from other religions or systems of philosophy, especially from the great religions of the world. I quote from a *Manual of Theology*, which is one of the best of its kind, the following: 'From all religions, Christian theology can learn something, and from the great religions much, even though it can teach them more.' A speculative theologian who ignores the Scriptural

principle may, perhaps, in building up his philosophico-theological system, learn something from Buddhism, Hinduism, Confucianism, and other human systems of religion, but a theologian who finds the fountain of truth in the revelation of God in His Word has only one Master, and is willing to sit at His feet, who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. A theologian whose aim it is to present the Christian religion, pure and undefiled, will probably concede that formally and historically theologians derive something from non-Christian sources, and none will deny that in the formative period of the old Catholic Church the Greek church-fathers have not in vain studied the works of Plato, Aristotle, and even Pontinus, and have thereby been enabled to handle the problems that came up in their days in a scholarly manner; but materially, ethnical religions do not contribute anything to Christianity. In the works of the church-fathers may be found here and there traces of the influence of their contemporaneous philosophers, as Kant and Hegel have exerted an influence in their times; but it is not Christianity as a religion which has been developed into a more comprehensive religion than it was before. There is development of our knowledge of God's truth, but there is no evolution of new truths brought about by the studies of the theologians of the religio-historical school. It is the philosophical theology of modern theologians which is syncretistic, but by no means the Christian religion. The more conservative among modern theologians allow that Christianity is an original religion, which in the course of time has absorbed all the better elements of other religions; but the more radical among them assert that Christianity is nothing but an aggregate of all kinds of doctrines and maxims. What do you say about the following definition of a syncretistic religion? 'A syncretistic religion is a religion which consists of a combination of elements taken over substantially unchanged from earlier faiths, and without any distinctive character or new contribution of its own.' Is Christianity such a crazy-quilt of many and manifold bits of religious odds and ends? The above-quoted definition certainly cannot be applied to Christianity. Such a mechanical aggregate of parts which have no organic connection would resemble a mosaic rather than a living religion. I wonder whether anywhere such a religion is found. And yet the theologian from whose manual I have quoted finds it at least *plausible* to look upon Christianity as a syncretistic religion.

"The great mistake the new theologians make consists in emphasizing natural religion and the development of all existing religions, Christianity included, in harmony with the theory of evolution. It is revived Deism and Rationalism. Natural religion

is the religion of the natural man, who is in rebellion against God. It is on this account that all ethical religions have many things in common. They all are perversions of the truth. Left to our natural religious instincts, we never find God; for only he who beholds the Son beholds the Father. No man cometh to the Father but by our blessed Savior, the only-begotten Son of God. Christianity is God's gift to lost man. Christianity only is the remedial scheme whereby man is restored to primitive simplicity and future glory. It is the only true religion, which will be hailed by such who as sinners look for a way to God, and as saints desire to walk in this way the Father has disclosed to them in His infinite mercy. To call Christianity a syncretistic religion is a libel of the grossest kind and an act of the basest ingratitude to God for His unspeakable gift. Has theology to build up our Christian religion, developing it up to date with the help of the vagaries of the perverted mind and imagination of fallen man? The Lord forbid! Our great task is to find out more and more the simplicity and sublimity of the only true religion, revealed to us in Christ."

PRECISION AND DECISION have always been regarded as indispensable requisites for effectual teaching. A discussion between two prominent scholars in London partly turns on this matter, and leads the *Presbyterian* to say editorially:—

"There has been considerable complaint on the part of students, especially in our theological seminaries, because of certain indefiniteness in the instruction. The teachers cite a variety of opinion on certain points, and then leave the students uninformed as to which is true, or as to whether the positions cited are true.

"This is unfair to the student, and untrue to the teachers' responsibility. Men are put into teachers' chairs, not simply to cite opinions, but to teach truths and give the reasons therefor. In fact, when a teacher cites an opinion without disapproval, it means approval, or else it has no significance, and is a foolish action.

"But it is to be feared that this practice is due to cowardice upon the part of the teacher. Believing, for himself, certain things which are contrary to the purpose of the chair he occupies, the teacher cites those things, and thus, having left them in the mind of the student to do their baneful work, he lacks courage to carry them out to full argument.

"The teacher who is employed to teach any subject should be informed upon that subject. He should be able to set forth truth and errors pertaining to it, and to defend the one and disprove the other.

"There are points in all subjects which remain uncertain and

undecided. Then the teacher should be honest, and acknowledge the limitations. Nothing is more mischievous toward a student, mentally and morally, than to cultivate indefiniteness and uncertainty. Harold M. Weiner, a well-known critic of London, in a reply to Dr. Driver, has this to say, which is both sane and helpful:—

“What would any junior student understand by this? One view is mentioned, only to be rejected; certain views are cited without any suggestion that there is any objection to them, or any warning as to adopting them; and other interpretations are not even mentioned. A commentator who puts forward certain views without objective question, warning, expression of doubt, or alternative, must be held to recommend those views. Surely, he cannot be supposed to put them forward because he does not adopt them. Surely, too, no schoolboy would suspect that the commentator regards them as incorrect. If the commentator does not believe the interpretations he himself adduces without doubt or question, what on earth does he believe or mean his readers to believe?”

“We are persuaded that Weiner is right, and that he hits a practice that is as mischievous as it is common in both oral and written instruction.”

Definiteness in teaching is the fruit of definite beliefs. A theology of doubt, skepticism, and denial must of necessity lead to indefiniteness in teaching. A theologian speaks with authority and finality when he speaks after Him of whom it is written: “He taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes.”

IN THESE DAYS OF FERMENT AND AGITATION in the churches it is well to be reminded of a saying of Peloubet, the well-known author of religious literature for the young:—

“There is a continual temptation to-day for Christian workers to give up their time and strength to discussing the many theories and unsettled questions which are continually confronting them. All sorts of men say all sorts of things, till it seems as if these clouds were obscuring the whole continent of truth. This is true of many other things besides religion. Now, the way to escape from these snares is to attend to our duties; to go to work for the cause of Christ with all our hearts; to give ourselves to helping save our fellow-men, both body and soul. For then we will use the essential things by which our work is accomplished. We thus test the working theories by using them. Those principles that bring results are the ones we want. We find out what they are worth through testing them by what they will do. Working for Christ and for His children is our safeguard.”

WINSTON CHURCHILL, author of some stirring historical novels that have delighted Americans ("Richard Carvel," "The Crisis," "The Crossing," "Coniston"), is reported to be advocating "Christian Anarchism." Says *The Presbyterian*:—

"But Mr. Churchill magnifies the individual over society, and states that the essence of Christianity is the placing of authority in the individual soul. He attempts this definition: 'The Christian ideal is the least possible government, a government wherein neither you nor I, nor any other man or woman, will labor and obey because we have to, but because we have learned the lesson which Christ taught, that happiness lies alone in service, in giving to the world that which God gave us.'

"Mr. Churchill says many things that are true. But he is dreaming of a time when the Kingdom of Glory shall be fulfilled, when there shall be a new earth, 'wherein dwelleth righteousness,' when the Sermon on the Mount has been realized, when men will have become perfect, even as their Father in heaven is perfect. He skips over the period through which we are now passing, when evil is still battling with good, darkness with light, and sin with righteousness. It would be well to remember what our Lord said: 'Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's;' and the words of the Apostle, when he said: 'The powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God;' and again: 'The Law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient.' When all men are righteous, Mr. Churchill's dream or ideal will be realized. The great work now is to have men become righteous. And this is the present work of Christianity and the Church. 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things will be added unto you.'"

Even after "the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness," i. e., the life everlasting, after the consummation of this present world, will have come, there will be neither "anarchism" nor "Christian anarchism." The Lord God omnipotent will reign even then, over His saints in glory, over His enemies in justice.

OUR PRESENT PRESIDENT PLAINLY A TOOL OF ROME.—The following official documents are making history in our Republic at the present time. To the well-informed and observing they merely confirm past impressions, *vis.*, that Rome held both, the past and the present, incumbents of the presidential office in her leading strings. The documents read:—

“DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, OFFICE COMMISSIONER OF
INDIAN AFFAIRS.

“Circular No. 601.

Washington, January 27, 1912.

“Religious Insignia.

“To Superintendents in charge of Indian Schools:—

“In accordance with that essential principle in our national life, the separation of Church and State, as applied by me to the Indian Service, which as to ceremonies and exercises is now being enforced under the existing religious regulations, I find it necessary to issue this order supplementary to those regulations, to cover the use at those exercises, and at other times, of insignia and garb as used by various denominations. At exercises of any particular denomination there is, of course, no regulation in this respect, but at the general assembly exercises and in the public school-rooms, or on the grounds when on duty, insignia or garb has no justification.

“In government schools all insignia of any denomination must be removed from all public rooms, and members of any denomination wearing distinctive garb should leave such garb off while engaged at lay duties as government employees. If any case exists where such an employee cannot conscientiously do this, he will be given a reasonable time, not to extend, however, beyond the opening of the school-year after the date of this order, to make arrangements for employment elsewhere than in Federal Indian schools.

“Respectfully,

“ROBERT G. VALENTINE.”

This just order, which was in absolute harmony with the spirit and letter of our basic law, and in keeping with our past history, President Taft has, after a visit from a certain Rev. Ketcham at the White House, rescinded by the following letter to the Secretary of the Interior:—

“My Dear Mr. Secretary:—

“It has been brought to my attention that an order has been issued by the Commission of Indian Schools. This order relates to the general matter which you and I have had under consideration and concerning which, at your request, the commissioner was collecting detailed information for our advice. The commissioner's order has been made without consultation either with you or with me. It not only prohibits the use of distinctive religious insignia at school exercises, but also the wearing of distinctive religious garb by school employees, and provides that if any school employee cannot conscientiously comply with the order, such employee will be given a reasonable time, not to extend, however, beyond the opening of the next school-year, to make arrangements for employment elsewhere

than in Federal Indian schools. I fully believe in the principle of the separation of Church and State on which our Government is based, but the questions presented by this order are of great importance and delicacy. They arise out of the fact that the Government has for a considerable period taken for the use of the Indian certain schools theretofore belonging to, and conducted by, distinctive religious societies or churches. As a part of the arrangements then made the school employees, who were in certain cases members of religious orders, wearing the distinctive garb of these orders, were continued as teachers by the Government, and by ruling of the Civil Service Commission or by executive action they have been included in the classified service under the protection of the Civil Service law. The commissioner's order almost necessarily amounts to a discharge from the Federal service of those who have entered it. This should not be done without a careful consideration of all phases of the matter, nor without giving the persons directly affected an opportunity to be heard. As the order would not in any event take effect until the beginning of the next school-year, I direct that it be revoked, and that action by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in respect thereto be suspended until such time as will permit a full hearing to be given to all parties in interest, and a conclusion to be reached in respect to the matter after full deliberation.

"Sincerely yours,

"(Signed) WILLIAM H. TAFT."

Before the foregoing order of the President was issued, Chas. L. Thompson, President of the Home Mission Council of National Protestant Mission Boards and Societies, had addressed the following telegram to the President:—

"The White House, Washington, D. C.

"The President:—

"The action of the Honorable Commissioner of Indian Affairs issued January twenty-seventh relative to sectarian insignia and garb in Federal Indian schools, is to our minds so manifestly American in spirit, judicial and righteous, that we heartily approve and commend it. We did not know that such an order was in preparation. But we now express our commendation and ask that nothing be permitted to weaken its force. We desire our representatives to have a conference with you if you find opportunity and occasion for this."

This request for a conference was not granted.

THE LITERARY DIGEST, with its customary partiality to the Catholics, claims that no Protestant journal has disapproved of President Taft's act in suspending Commissioner Valentine's order

to enforce a common rule of our country so far as it applied to his office. *The Literary Digest* in this case has not waited to hear and digest Protestant opinion. Here is one from *The Presbyterian* of February 28:—

“Some of our government officials have been guilty of partiality and inconsistency. President Taft made a great mistake when he recently reversed the order of the Commissioner of Indian Education. Commissioner Valentine simply gave the general order that, while teachers were doing lay work in the service of the nation, they must not display church insignia. This order was not in the interest of any party or sect, but common to all. But President Taft reversed it, giving as his reason that the parties should be heard before the order was given. We see no reason for this as it is only the statement of an American principle long since established—the separation of Church and State. Neither Mr. Taft nor any other man could pass upon this principle or the expression of it. The commissioner was simply doing his duty.”

THE TRUTH SEEKER, of New York, is quite correct when it values President Taft's claim that in spite of his suspension of Commissioner Valentine's order he believes in the separation of Church and State, at the following heavy discount: “As a government employee, the teacher represents the state. In wearing the religious garb, the employee represents the Church. Church and State are united in that employee, and anybody, whether President or priest, who would permit such a union *is not honest* when affirming his belief in separation.” We cast our humble vote the same way. We think the President's assurance is not worth the paper it was written on. *Facta loquuntur*.

HERE IS A WHITE RAVEN. In discussing the dangerous pressure and arrogant demands of Romanism in our country, an anonymous writer in *The Presbyterian* says:—

“If we—Protestants of every name—are to hold our heritage, is not the great struggle of the Reformation to be fought over again? It is clear to every one who has watched the drift of religious thought for the last quarter of a century that the doctrine of salvation by works in some form is rapidly taking the place of the Scriptural teaching of salvation by grace. Within the more pronounced Protestant churches there has been a growing rejection of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, with the substitution of salvation by personal character; or, as one preacher has announced it, ‘every man his own savior.’

“With Rome and the Romanizing bodies, Christ and His atone-

ment are not so much denied as they are buried under the wood, hay, and stubble of sacerdotal rites. These are the facts confronting evangelical Christendom to-day. They are not trifles. How are they to be met? Is the Gospel of Christ to be crucified between the two malefactors, infidelity and superstition? Luther was right when he said that Justification by Faith was the article of a standing or a falling Church. All our activities cannot save us if we abandon the foundation of human hope."

Rome *does* deny dogmatically the atonement of Christ for actual sins, besides burying it in the manner stated above. It is only when this fact is understood that Rome's true character is seen. Rome is "the mystery of iniquity," "the man of sin," "the son of perdition," and Antichrist, because it nullifies the entire work of Christ. Rome destroys the authority of the civil powers, but this is as nothing to the destruction which it has wrought in the Church of God. For this reason Luther prayed: "*Deus vos impleat odio papae!*" That prayer was not inspired by vengefulness or malice, but by a clear insight into the real inwardness of the papacy. One might wish that such knowledge of Romanism as is exhibited in the above quotation might spread among all the Christian churches of our country. It is very, very rare.

AT THE OFFICE OF THE AMERICAN CITIZEN, 120 Tremont St., Boston, Mass., a letter is exhibited to any one who will call to inspect it. The letter was sent to a Protestant who had been mistaken for a Romanist. The letter requires no comment. We offer it as collateral evidence to the truth of things that have been published in the QUARTERLY for the last three years. This is the letter:—

DIRECTORS OF THE CATHOLIC MISSIONARY UNION.

MOST REV. J. M. FARLEY, D. D.,
Archbishop of New York, Pres.

MOST REV. JOHN IRELAND, D. D.,
Archbishop of St. Paul.

RT. REV. MATTHEW HARKINS,
Bishop of Providence, R. I.

VERY REV. E. E. DYER, S. S.,
Pres. St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore.

REV. MATTHEW A. TAYLOR.

VERY REV. A. P. DOYLE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

REV. WALTER ELLIOTT,
of the Paulist Fathers.

Represented by
THE MISSIONARY.

The Catholic Missionary Union.

Under its Auspices
The Apostolic Mission House.

Washington, Brookland Station, D. C., February 6, 1912.

My Dear Friend:—

How near at hand do you think is the time when America will be dominantly Catholic? Things move on with rapid strides these days, and the recent creating of three American cardinals has brought the Church once more to the forefront. The dominant note in the

address of the Holy Father as well as in the replies of the cardinals is the hope of wonderful progress among English-speaking peoples. They have all spoken of "the era of convert-making." All this indicates a marvelous advance along the lines whereon the missionaries of the Apostolic Mission House have been working these twenty years.

If all the priests and laity would turn their faces to this one goal, what a tremendous impetus the movement would get! One of our great leaders recently said—and there is a burning truth in it: "We must labor to gain the confidence, love, and respect of the American people. This once gained, the Catholic Church, in her way to claim the American heart, may carry a thousand dogmas on her back."

Last year our missionaries gave hundreds of missions, and the record of convert-making is now away beyond the thirty-five thousand mark each year. Just think what this means! This estimate says nothing of the thousands of fallen-away Catholics that have been brought back to a good life.

Come with us and share the glories of this work!

Sincerely yours in Xto,

Catholic Missionary Union.

A. P. DOYLE, *Treasurer.*

A GREAT "IF."—Not so long ago prominent men in the Presbyterian Church were pooh-poohing the idea of Roman domination in our country. Charles Francis Greene, in reviewing some anti-Roman literature for the *Princeton Review* two years ago, remarked: "What would happen if the majority of our American citizens were devout Roman Catholics, seems to us somewhat like the question, 'If the skies were to fall, would we all catch larks?'" There seems to have occurred a slight awakening of late; for *The Presbyterian* is beginning to take notice of the growing Roman influence at Washington. But even now this journal, noting the concern of *Zion's Herald*, New England's Methodist paper, about the designs of Romanism on America, says: "We have much sympathy with the concern shown by our contemporary. But the spirit of liberty and tolerance is too strongly entrenched in our American life to allow such a conquest." And then the paper goes on to say, clearly admitting the existence of the danger which it has minimized: "If Protestantism will bestir itself and rise to its true self, it can neither be uprooted nor conquered. . . . If Protestants stand true to their position, any attempt of Catholicism to subdue this land will be met by such reaction as will repeat Catholic experience in other nations." In our opinion these "ifs" deserve to be writ large with a

great question-mark behind them. Protestantism has in many quarters thrown away its only efficient weapon for attacking Rome, the inspired Word of God. In other quarters it has been lulled into the fatal sleep of indifferentism and security. Now that the call is heard throughout the land: Beware of Rome! many Protestants act like drowsy people who are unwilling to be roused, and many pretend to see nothing worth fighting for. Besides, the prospect of history repeating itself in our country, as regards the old war of the nations against Rome's cunning and violence, is not a pleasant one. — The men of the present generation have reason to ask themselves what their children will think of them fifty years hence, if Rome keeps up her present aggressiveness in our country. The greatest danger, however, arising from an ascendancy of Rome in our country, is a spiritual and religious, not a political one, though that is great enough. Modern Protestantism has ceased to regard the papacy as "the mystery of iniquity," the destroyer of God's truth and of the sinner's righteousness by faith in Christ Jesus.

BOOK REVIEW.

Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., announces the following publications:—

1. **BIBEL NR. 1912.** In three styles, at \$1.50, \$2.75, and \$4.00, 40 cts. carriage additional.

This is a German family Bible, reproducing faithfully Luther's version, only the old orthography having been changed to the modern. The Bible text is in fairly large, clear-cut, characteristic letters, and well printed on thin paper of sufficient consistency to carry ink. By this device the bulk of the book has been considerably reduced. All prominent texts have been printed in bold-face type. The book contains 240 illustrations of Schnorr von Carolsfeld, struck from good plates. The Apocrypha are printed in smaller type. Ten Biblical charts are added at the end, and a family chronology has been provided at the front. The binding is strong and yielding, the cover is embossed with a chastely ornate design. All features considered, the price is a marvel of cheapness. We do not know of a possible competitor of this beautiful Bible in the book-market of to-day, and we do not believe that its excellencies can be surpassed in the near future. It is one of the most creditable products which Concordia Publishing House has yet brought forward.

2. LENTEN PRAYERS. Compiled by *Rev. R. W. Huebsch*. 40 pages; 35 cts.

Sixty-three prayers from Rambach's *Meditations and Contemplations on the Sufferings of Our Lord* are here offered in a good translation, and in a plain but tasteful little book.

3. LEHRBUCH DER DEUTSCHEN SPRACHE fuer hoehere Schulen von *August Crull*. Third revised edition. XII and 234 pages; 85 cts.

In twelve years the first edition of Crull's *Lehrbuch* was exhausted; half that time sufficed to exhaust the second edition. This was possible with the limited market of our own synodical constituency, and shows the increasing demand for this book. This book deserves a national market. The students of German in America can find no book of its kind produced in our country which offers such wealth of information and exercise in as practical form as this one, and it is a question whether they could import a better one.

4. HILFSBUCH ZUR BIBLISCHEN GESCHICHTE fuer die Hand des Lehrers, im Anschluss an "Biblische Geschichten fuer Mittelklassen und gemischte Schulen" bearbeitet von *Wilh. Simon*, ev.-luth. Lehrer zu Schaumburg, Ill. XV and 503 pages; \$1.65.

Director Lindemann, in expounding the method to be followed by the instructor in Bible History, has laid down some excellent rules. His first and fundamental rule is, that the teacher *study* in the evening the lesson which he is to explain the next day. This may sound trite. Of course, we say, the teacher *must* study. But study is a relative term, at least, it practically becomes such. Not two teachers study alike, not two can. Some lack aids, and they may be dull at the time of study. Their study may yield paltry results. Others may have too many aids, and their imagination may be lively. These may not complete the task before them, because of the abundance of material which they must collect and digest. And a real study of a lesson in Bible History, according to our authority, is a complex effort. There is memorizing to do. There must be a proper disposition of the material to be treated. Uncommon and difficult terms must be explained in a few striking words. A map may have to be used; data from natural history or from chronology may have to be furnished; an available illustration may have to be explained. Last, not least, the objective of the story, the "pointe," must be fixed.

The book before us meets these wants, every one of them. It is the most practical, most efficient, and most delightful aid to a

teacher at his preparation for the Bible History lesson of which we have knowledge. If at any time in the history of our parochial schools the teacher's study in this department was made pleasant, well-directed, and fruitful, it is now. We have only words of praise and commendation for this book.

The author's plan may be briefly sketched as follows: After some pertinent introductory remarks, he takes up the text of the story as it is offered in the text-book of the children. Every important term receives a brief illuminating gloss. Occasionally the equivalent term from the English Bible is given. At the end, references to cognate matter in the Catechism and hymn-book are given, and a list of collateral Bible readings is appended. A memorial verse, or stanza, concludes the whole. Critical points of doctrine are frequently explained in an excursus in small type after the treatise proper. The entire book is intended exclusively for the teacher.

Bible History has been correctly termed "the foundation of the entire instruction in religion, yea, of all true piety." Director Lindemann presented the importance of this study in his *Schulpraxis* (p. 22 f.) in these words: "The faith of Christianity rests on the divine revelation, on historical facts, without the knowledge of which no person can lay claim to the Christian religion and to a healthy life of faith. Stories, such as that of the creation of the world, and of the human race, of the fall, of the promise of salvation, of the gathering and guidance of the Church of God in the time of the Old Testament, of the manifestation of the Messiah, and the complete redemption of the entire world, finally, of the preaching of the Gospel among all nations — briefly, the history which the Holy Spirit has narrated in the Bible, everybody must necessarily know who wishes to be called a true Lutheran. It is this history, too, which, more than any other, produces true culture; for it is not only true in every respect, but it is told in a manner to make it truly beneficial. Except a person has learned from Bible History to understand the way in which God works, he can have no correct judgment of the modern history of the world and the Church. (Accordingly, a God-fearing peasant not infrequently has a better judgment of historical events than a learned professor who lacks the Biblical foundation.)

"Children understand the Bible stories with greater ease and better results than the abstract teaching of the Catechism. For this reason, the first and best religious training that can be offered them is, to tell them Bible stories. In the various characters and nations that occur in these stories, the children learn to understand most clearly, on the one hand, the great corruption of the entire nature

of man, on the other, the mercy of God and the operations of His grace. In studying others, they learn to know their own heart,—they learn to regard unbelief as the perdition, faith as the only salvation of every person. They learn that men, left to their own devices, rush headlong into one misfortune after the other, and have no peace, except when they suffer the Gospel to heal them. They learn to regard earth as a vale of sorrows on account of sin. They learn that all the saints have found comfort in their heavenly citizenship, of which, in accordance with the divine promise, they became partakers by faith.—Such knowledge is truly enlivening and saving knowledge.”

We congratulate all who must teach Bible History to children upon the publication of Teacher Simon's book.

5. THE SCOTFIELD REFERENCE BIBLE. Authorized Version, with a New System of Connected Topical References to all the greater themes of Scripture, with annotations, revised marginal renderings, summaries, definitions, and index. To which are added helps at hard places, explanations of seeming discrepancies, and a new system of paragraphs. Edited by *Rev. C. I. Scofield*, D. D. Oxford University Press. 1362 pages, and an indexed atlas of the Bible; \$4.00.

The character of this Bible is indicated by the exhaustive title, which adequately describes the various efforts made in this book to lead the student of the Bible to a correct and full understanding of its meaning in particular places, of its plan and scope in a given book, of its harmonious teaching throughout, and to facilitate a comprehensive grasp of its teaching. Dr. Scofield has had the co-operation of men of national reputation in the preparation of this Bible, *viz.*, Dr. Weston of the Crozier Seminary, Dr. Gray of the Moody Bible Institute, Dr. Erdmann of Princeton Seminary, Dr. Moorehead of Xenia U. P. Theological Seminary, Dr. Harris of the Toronto Bible Institute, Dr. Arthur T. Pierson, and Arno C. Gaebelein. Besides these, European scholars, like Prof. Barrelet, of the Theological Faculty of Lausanne, Professors Sayce and Margoliouth of Oxford, and Mr. Walter Scott, have aided the work by “suggestions of inestimable value.”

The feature from which this Bible derives its name, are the subject references, found in the center of the page. Any important Biblical concept is noted at the place where it occurs for the first time; the next place where it occurs again is indicated, and the

first and last places in the entire Bible where the concept is found are given in brackets at each link of the chain. Take, *e. g.*, the concept "inspiration;" the system of references directs us first to Exod. 4, 15, thence to vv. 28 and 30, thence to ch. 17, 14, to 19, 6, 7, to 20, 1, to 24, 3, 4, 7, 8, 12, to 32, 16, to 34, 1, 27, 28, to 35, 1; to Num. 11, 24, to 22, 38, to 23, 5, 12—16; to Deut. 4, 2, 13, and along a line running through the following passages: Deut. 5, 22; 10, 1—4; 29, 29; 31, 24; 2 Sam. 23, 2; Job 6, 10; 32, 18; Ps. 68, 11; Is. 6, 5—9; 8, 1; 30, 8; 59, 21; Jer. 1, 9; 30, 2; 36, 1—32; 45, 1, 2; Ezek. 2, 2; Amos 3, 7; Micah 3, 8; Hab. 2, 2; Zech. 7, 7; Matt. 4, 4, 7, 10; 5, 18; 10, 14; 11, 13; 12, 3—5, 40; 19, 4—8; 22, 31, 32; 24, 15, 37—39; 26, 54; 28, 19, 20; Mark 1, 44; 7, 8—13; 10, 4—9, 19; 12, 26, 36; Luke 1, 3; 4, 17—21, 27; 10, 16; 11, 49—51; 16, 29—31; 17, 27, 29, 32; 20, 37; 24, 25—27, 44, 45; John 3, 14; 5, 46, 47; 6, 31, 32, 45, 49, 63; 7, 21—23; 8, 40, 47, 56; 12, 48; 13, 18; 14, 10; 15, 27; 16, 12, 13; 17, 8, 17, 20; Acts 1, 8, 16; 9, 15; 28, 25; Rom. 16, 25, 26; 1 Cor. 2, 7, 16; 14, 37; Gal. 1, 11, 12; Eph. 3, 3, 5; 6, 17; 1 Tim. 4, 1; 2 Tim. 3, 16; 1 Pet. 1, 10—12, 25; 2 Pet. 1, 21; Rev. 1, 1, 19; 2, 1, 8, 12, 18; 3, 1, 7, 14; 14, 13; 19, 9; 21, 5; 22, 18, 19. We have selected one of the most exhaustive chains of references, in order to enable any one who will take the trouble to test both the strong and the weak points of the chain. Not every link in the chain is of equal value; some might have been omitted, others inserted, *e. g.*, Ps. 45, 1. The chain can be picked up at any point along the line, and can be traced forward, but not backward. — The text of the Bible has been divided into paragraphs by italicized sub-heads; however, the chapter and verse divisions of the Authorized Version have been preserved. Here, too, opinions will be found expressed from which one must dissent. *E. g.*, the sequence of events in Gen. 1, 1—3 is represented thus: v. 1 recounts the original creation; this is destroyed by some unknown catastrophe, the results of which are stated in v. 2, and Jer. 4, 23—26 is cited to justify this idea; v. 3 recounts "the new beginning." — Trichotomy is taught in the note to Gen. 1, 27. — Among the definitions we note that of justification in a note on Rom. 3, 28: "J. may be defined as the judicial act of God whereby He justly declares righteous one who believes on Jesus Christ. It is the Judge Himself who thus declares. The justified believer has been in court, and has been cleared." — Each book of the Bible is provided with an introduction. — Marginal notes briefly explaining points in Biblical archaeology, chronology, are given *in loco*. — The expository notes are really helpful, and, upon the whole, this Bible is the soberest of the annotated Bibles that have been published in our generation.

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XVI.

JULY, 1912.

No. 3.

PRACTICAL RESULTS OF MONISM.

A current definition of monism runs thus: "The doctrine of cosmology that attempts to explain the phenomena of the cosmos by one principle of being or ultimate substance."¹⁾ Arthur Drews, a monist, defines monism as "that view of the cosmos which admits but one principle or one ground of reality." In a recent brochure, Superintendent Repke has sketched the various types of this philosophical theory.²⁾ There is a materialistic monism, which reduces every phenomenon in the universe to a basis of matter. Then there is an idealistic monism, which claims that matter has no independent existence; it is a mere conception of the mind; every phenomenon is a product of the spirit. Lastly, there is a pantheistic monism. Its chief apostle is Eduard v. Hartmann, who observes that there is a parallelism between nature and spirit: in nature he finds force and law, or a principle of energy and of order; the counterparts of these two elements in the realm of the spirit are: will and mind. Force and will represent the unlogical, law and mind the logical, in the two hemispheres which monism assumes for its cosmos. But these four elements: force, law, will, mind, are not four different substances, but manifestations of the same, in fact, of the only substance. The multitude of volitions which individuals put forth are but movements of the absolute will; and the host of ideas, or ideal distinctions, become concentrated

1) Standard Dictionary.

2) *Pantheistischer und deistischer Monismus*, in *Bibl. Zeit- und Streitfragen* VII, 8.

in the unity of the absolute idea. God is the common subject of the consciousness of all individuals and of all volitions of individuals; in other words, wherever there is a thought or a volition, it is God who thinks that thought and wills that volition. This common subject, however, of all thinking and willing which takes place in the world, is himself—or we should rather say itself—without consciousness; He—it—is the all-one, and is diffused as the impersonal will and the unconscious intelligence throughout this world of personal and unconscious individuals.

This is v. Hartmann's *Philosophie des Unbewussten* in a nutshell. Wilhelm von Schopenhauer praises this philosophy as the only genuine pantheism, because it does justice equally to the *πάν* and to the *θεός*. Leonhard Veeh hails this philosophy as an epochal discovery, a mighty step forward on the road of progress, a system which is destined to fructify the entire cultural life of to-day. Arthur Drews pronounces this philosophy the true solution of the world-riddle, and commends it to all who in our day are searchers after truth. Repke acknowledges that this philosophy is dominant in modern monistic circles.

We offer the last remark as part of the apology which, we feel, we owe our readers for inflicting Hartmann upon them. But monism is not a mere fancy of university professors. It threatens to enter—it has entered—in its practical consequences, the everyday life of to-day.

First, as a determined antagonist of the fundamentals of Christian belief.

The pantheistic monist scouts the belief in a personal God. Von Hartmann has declared the personal God an idea that might be tolerated, provided the definition of a personal God be restricted to an individuality connected with will and intelligence. "But," he adds, "as to individuals endowed with will and intelligence, there are many. Still, they do not for that reason correspond to our conception of personality (e. g., brutes, savages, feeble-minded persons). We deny to these the designation of personalities. Why should we not assume the

same reserve over and against an individual which no longer corresponds to the idea of personality, because it is exalted above all the limitations which are the characteristic marks of this idea? A degradation of God, the highest being, must be charged not against those who deny, but against those who ascribe, personality to God."

The pantheistic monist ridicules prayer. Von Hartmann holds that the personal God is an invention of men who wish to coordinate themselves with God whenever they enter into a familiar conversation with Him ("sich auf du und du stellen") in prayer, when they expect of Him to share their feelings, when they piously revere, but actually treat Him as on a level with themselves. Prayer is really a monologue. It has no objective meaning and efficacy, and, hence, it is immaterial whether you direct your prayer to this or that address. Faith in prayer is illusory. The person praying practices self-deception. He speaks to a fictitious being.³⁾

Pantheistic monism rejects Jesus Christ. "Faith in Jesus as a psychological personality is in no respect superior to faith in any other personality, such as Goethe, Bismarck, etc. We have merely a historical, but no religious interest whatever, in the man Jesus. . . . This much, surely, has now been established by Protestant Bible criticism, that the *historic* Jesus was not the Jesus proclaimed by liberal pastors to-day, nor the Jesus of the Gospels, and that the Jesus who is usually exhibited to the masses by theologians in the pulpit and in

3) "Erwaegt man weiter, dass aus philosophischem Gesichtspunkt der praktische Nerv des Gebets ohnehin schon dadurch gelahmt ist, dass ihm nach der modernen Weltanschauung nur noch eine rein subjektive Bedeutung und Wirksamkeit zugeschrieben werden kann, so erscheint der Wert jenes den Gedanken widerstreitenden Gemuetspostulats auch von dieser Seite mehr als zweifelhaft; denn wenn ich einmal die illusorische Beschaffenheit des Glaubens an eine objektive Bedeutung und Wirksamkeit des Gebets erkannt habe, so ist die Beschaffenheit der objektiven Adresse, an die das Gebet gerichtet wird, voellig gleichgueltig geworden, da es sich in Wahrheit doch nur um einen Monolog handelt, dem die etwaige Taschenspielererei einer bewussten Selbsttaeuschung hinsichtlich eines fingierten Angeredeten an Wert nichts zulegen kann." (*Phil. d. Unb.* II, 191.)

popular discourses, is an ideal figure, decked out for a purpose, and out of harmony with historic reality, except, perhaps, in name and in a few indifferent details." ⁴⁾

Secondly, pantheistic monism has blasted the ethical conceptions of Christianity.

It acknowledges no such thing as personal responsibility. Everything that a person thinks, wills, or does, is chargeable to God. "Everything must, with equal directness, be referred back to God, sin as well as grace, faith as well as unbelief, knowledge as well as error, grief as well as joy." ⁵⁾ Personal guilt is impossible, since the authority at whose tribunal man would have to render an account of his conduct is the cause and originator of man's action. In other words, God can judge no one, for He would only be judging Himself.

Pantheistic monism spurns the idea of sin, and of a divine law determining what is sin and fixing its consequences. Nietzsche distinguishes between "Herrenmoral" and "Sklavenmoral." To the mind of lords the proud, exalted feelings of the soul would appear virtuous, while the mind of serfs would pronounce humility, resignation, love of fellow-men virtues. There is no objective basis for determining what is good. The monist Braun ⁶⁾ declares: "In our view, ethics is . . . the enactment and unfolding of our true self." Individuality is the real virtue. There must be no subordination to any norm that is considered superior to the individual. Braun grants that, on this basis, any whim, fancy, desire, etc., for which individual propensity exists must be permissible. Drews differs from this view. He considers individualism the source and root of all evil and suffering. He draws a distinction between self and *ego*. The self in man is consubstantial with God, the *ego* is a foreign element which must be overcome. Self-consciousness must expel *ego*-consciousness. This is done by man fixing his own laws, not by a mere subjective caprice, but in

4) Arthur Drews, *Die Religion als Selbstbewusstsein Gottes*. I, 201.

5) Schrempf, *Monismus und Christentum*, cited by Drews, l. c., p. 197.

6) Braun, *Monismus und Ethik*, cited by Drews, l. c., p. 129.

obedience to his teleological ends, i. e., to that destiny which God in His world-plan has settled for him. Nietzsche insists that the true unfolding of man's self must be effected, not by the exercise of love and pity, but of relentless force. "We must seek out those things that make us hard. Steel is hardened by fire: we must steel our will in the fire of unbridled passions. Such fires, however, have ever been kindled by what is evil, cruel, savage, tyrannical. Hence, man must become better by becoming ever more evil. The evil is man's best strength." He advocates that cruelty be increased in order that life may become more intense. "The serpent must first become a dragon; then some one may become a hero by slaying the dragon. When large and powerful animals tear each other to pieces, there is a more glorious selection afterwards from the still larger and more powerful which survive, and the most splendid type is that largest and most powerful one which conquers all." This is simply teaching that might constitutes right, and that unchecked lust and passionate impulse for gratifying lust is the law of right living and of fulfilling one's mission.

Pantheistic monism regards death as the apotheosis of man. "God can never be anything but man's real self." "Man, in his essence, is himself God." This fact is fully realized in death. Death is the complete dissolution of the *ego*. The *ego* was a mere delusion. This delusion is dissipated by death. Man sacrifices his substantiality and *ego*, and at this price purchases the absolute supremacy of his self. By dying, man proves that his *ego* was "a mountebank acting the role of a king." Death is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the *ego*.⁷⁾

Pantheistic monism speaks of a redemption. To redeem means to recognize the illusory character of the *ego*, to dismiss the *ego* from one's sphere of interests, to elevate oneself so far above the *ego* as no longer to entertain any hopes, fears, or desires concerning it, and to consider oneself merely as an

7) Drews, *Die Religion*, pp. 445. 495. 513.

organ of the absolute and his super-individual ends. In this manner man assumes internally a changed attitude toward the evils in the world which continue unchanged. This attitude does not engender positive delight, but it removes tedium, or reduces it to a minimum. This is "an ideal redemption." However, inasmuch as the sorrow of man is the sorrow of God, man's redemption affects God. Accordingly, it is not God who redeems man, but God is redeemed by man.⁸⁾

Lastly, pantheistic monism is outspoken in its hatred and contempt of the Christian religion.

Ernst Horneffer regards the Christian religion as a mortal assault which the baser Asiatic race made upon the more refined race of Europe, whose first representatives were the Greeks. "What is Christianity? What is paganism? Not to believe in man, in the innate strength of man, is Christianity. To believe in man, in the self-sufficiency of man, in the nobility of every being, is paganism. In particular, faith in a revelation, in a fixed and abiding religious truth and religious authorities, is of Asiatic origin; for in the Orient there has prevailed since times immemorial the fettered spirit, that tight-laced mode of living within firm and unalterable conceptions and rigid immovable forms."⁹⁾ Such a faith he regards as an impossibility, "Unding," on European soil. He calls Christianity Oriental atavism, barbarism, "eine Unkultur," i. e., the opposite of culture.

Leonhard Veeh says: "There are foreign racial instincts enslaving the German mind. Above all, there is a dualistic theism corroding its marrow. War must be declared against these . . . elements foreign to Germanic culture."¹⁰⁾

We drop the curtain on this loathsome view of abysmal apparitions. We recognize the spirit who speaks through these vapors, and we shudder.

Let us, however, not forget that pantheistic monism is not confined to Germany. Many of its ideas have been appro-

8) Repke, l. c., p. 19.

9) *Die kuenftige Religion*, p. 9.

10) Repke, p. 12.

priated and crudely reproduced in Christian Science. How much destruction of Christian faith it is working in our country in this form is apparent even to the casual observer. But also in its formidable scientific garb it has appeared in our country in the works of the Cairds and especially in Josiah Royce's *The Conception of God*, and *The World and the Individual*. Prof. Beckwith, indeed, holds that "a thorough-going pantheism has been precluded among English and American thinkers by a practical, common-sense quality of mind."¹¹) But it is not safe to indulge such optimism in the land of the proverbial humbug.

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE MISSOURI SYNOD.¹⁾

"Congenial minds meet; for whatsoever God wills must come to pass; the truth must not only separate, but also unite men,"²⁾—again and again this sentiment has been verified by the course of events in the history of the Christian Church. No person who has dared to speak God's truth to men for conscience' sake has, on the one hand, been spared the sorrow of beholding men arrayed against him who disputed his statements and questioned his motives, nor has he, on the other hand, been denied the comfort which comes from approval and comradeship won by the truth spoken. Luther describes his own experience thus: "Everybody is now lamenting and clamoring, because the Gospel causes so much unrest, strife, and disorder in the world. They say that since the Gospel is come, conditions are worse than at any previous time; for then there was peace and quiet everywhere; there were no persecutions, and men lived with one another as good friends and

11) *The New Schaaf-Herzog Encycl.* VIII, p. 331.

1) This article continues the series of articles inscribed "Walther the Lutheran." It is proposed, instead of continuing the original heading, to present the leading events exhibiting the quality of Walther's Lutheranism in separate articles with separate headings.

2) Hochstetter, *Gesch. d. ev.-luth. Missouri-Syn.*, p. 147.

neighbors.”³⁾ But Luther also lived to see the unifying effect of his testimony, and praised God for it.

We had recorded, in a previous issue, the severing of bonds of synodical fellowship in various parts of the American Lutheran Church, and the sincere regret which these events caused Walther. It had not been his intention originally to organize a new synod, but he had hoped that the existing Lutheran synods, by placing themselves fairly and squarely on the Lutheran confessions, would render it possible to him and his companions to unite with them. He would have been content to see the leaven of the truth work in the older Lutheran synods and gradually bring about a better state of affairs from the view-point of confessional Lutheranism. The idea of organizing a new synod was first suggested by a series of articles which appeared in the *Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, in 1845, under the caption: “What Are the Guiding Principles for the Organization of Orthodox Synods of the Lutheran Church in Our Country?” But Walther rejoiced at the idea suggested in these articles, and published the articles in *Der Lutheraner*, with the wish “that they might achieve the end for which they were written.”⁴⁾ The articles had been offered as a basis for fraternal discussion to all who “were of like mind with the author and favored his plan.” Walther had accepted them in that spirit. It was given to him later to help carry the plan into execution.

In the spring of 1846, Revs. A. Ernst, Fr. Lochner, and Dr. Sihler met in conference with Walther, Loeber, Keyl, Gruber, Fuerbringer, and Schieferdecker to prepare a draft for a synodical constitution. Walther enlivened the discussions and materially contributed toward shaping the various parts of the constitution by exhibiting point for point from the Scriptures the pure Lutheran doctrine concerning the Church, the Ministry, the Government of the Church, and Church Ordinances. At the close of the conference it was agreed to meet once more at Fort Wayne before taking the final steps for

3) 7, 402.

4) 2, 29 f. 33 f. 55 f.

effecting the proposed synodical organization. This second conference was held in July, 1846, at Dr. Sihler's residence. It was more largely attended by pastors who had not been able to travel the long distance to St. Louis. Loeber, Walther, Keyl, and Brohm had come from Missouri. The draft for the constitution was carefully gone over, revised, perfected, and ordered printed in *Der Lutheraner* and in pamphlet form for distribution among the congregations. The Synodical Constitution is the initial article in vol. 3 of Walther's church-paper, and follows immediately after the enthusiastic Preface which we published in vol. XV, p. 200 ff. The original purpose of the founders of the Missouri Synod is plainly expressed in the

PREAMBLE.

While it is certain that the Church is not established or preserved by a constitution, but solely by the pure and unadulterated preaching of the holy Gospel and by the correct administration of the holy sacraments, nevertheless it is equally certain that a sound constitution, not contrary to Scripture, helps to make the Church flourishing.⁵⁾

Here, in the United States of North America, *e. g.*, it would hardly be possible for all the separate Lutheran congregations, without a joint organization of the Church, to retain the pure doctrine, and to resist the inroads of errorists. Nor would they thus be able jointly to labor for the attainment of their ends and aims, on the basis of a common faith, and cooperating in love for the furtherance of the objects of the Church. (See ch. I, § 6.) Moved chiefly by these two considerations, the ministers of the Lutheran Church named below met for the purpose of drafting a synodical constitution that is not to rest

5) To cite an instance, 70 or 80 years ago rationalism invaded the Church, and instead of the faith of the Church unbelief was preached from many pulpits. In those days it was by the constitutions and regulations of the good old times in the Lutheran Church, by the orthodox forms of worship and liturgical acts, that the faith and confession of the Church was being nourished in the hearts of believers, that it was roused in those who were seeking it, and that the communion of the praying and confessing Church was preserved.

on the confessional writings of the Church merely as an advertisement, but is to be supported and pervaded in all its parts by the unadulterated confession and the pure doctrine of the Church, thus enabling and aiding the Church, in her confessing and indoctrinating activities, to take care of each particular church-issue. Two defects are to be remedied by this procedure: 1) The Confessions of the Church are not merely to receive external and passing mention, without exercising a disposing and formative influence on the entire constitution and on the entire activity of the Church, and without making it plain to everybody in what manner the Confessions and the doctrine enliven and pervade, not only in a general way, the common worship, the government and discipline of the church-body, but also particular enterprises, such as the establishment of institutions of learning, the publication of periodicals by the Church, the examination of candidates for the ministry, regulations for supplying the office of the ministry with incumbents, home and foreign missions, etc. We find this defect in the constitutions of those synods now existing, which show a certain outward respect to the Confessions of the Church, and formally accept them, though the practice in the churches in many and flagrant ways is in contradiction of the Confessions. 2) The other defect is this: for carrying on certain enterprises of the Church, such as the care of the poor and the sick, the work of mission, etc., private societies are likely to be organized which exist beside the Church, hold no connection or only a very loose connection with the Confessions of the Church, and, as a rule, are of the restless, busybody stamp of Methodism.

However, it was necessary to emphasize the fundamental and all-pervading character of the confessions of the Church, not only because of the most precious and important object contemplated and for the prevention of the two defects aforementioned, but chiefly on account of the Schmuckerians, *i. e.*, the so-called Lutheran General Synod. Everybody knows that this body has recently published its defection from the Lutheran

doctrine of the sacrament. This body seems to think that the Confessions of the Church do not rest on the unchangeable and eternal Word of God, and, hence, are alterable and equivocal, least of all, that they are to regulate, enliven, and pervade the entire practice of the Church.

The names of the Lutheran pastors who met in conference at Fort Wayne during the first part of June to deliberate on a synodical constitution, are as follows: Loeber, pastor at Altenburg, Perry Co., Mo.; Dr. Sihler, pastor at Fort Wayne, Ind.; Knape, pastor at Defiance, Henry Co., O.; Schmidt, pastor at Cleveland, O.; Ernst, pastor at Neuendettelsau, Union Co., O.; Walther, pastor at St. Louis, Mo.; Brohm, pastor at New York, N. Y.; Schneider, pastor at Marion, Marion Co., O.; Selle, pastor at Chicago, Ill.; Husmann, pastor in Marion Tp., Allen Co., Ind.; Craemer, pastor at Frankenmuth, Saginaw Co., Mich.; Trautmann, pastor at Danbury, Ottawa Co., O.; Hattstaedt, pastor at Monroe, Mich.; Detzer, pastor in Williams Co., O.; Burger, pastor at Willshire, Van Wert Co., and in Mercer Co., O.; Jaebker, pastor in Adams Co., Ind.

The following pastors who could not be present at the conference had expressed their cordial approval of the purpose of the meeting, *viz.*: Gruber, pastor at Paitzdorf, Perry Co., Mo.; Keyl, pastor at Frohna, Perry Co., Mo.; Fuerbringer, pastor at Elkhorn Prairie, Washington Co., Ill.; Schieferdecker, pastor in Monroe Co., Ill.; Buenger, pastor at St. Louis and in Central Tp., Mo.; Lochner, pastor at Toledo, O.

Finally, there were present the following candidates of the ministry: Lehmann, Schuster, Boehm, Wolf, Scholz.

The Constitution as drafted is appended, with explanatory notes.⁶⁾ This document deserves to be studied separately.

The first synodical convention met on Jubilate Sunday (April 25), 1847, in Pastor Selle's congregation at Chicago. Twelve pastors and sixteen congregations signed the Constitution, eleven pastors were present as advisory members, and a few communicated their approval of the organization in writing.

6) 3, 2—6. 8—10.

It was a very humble beginning. Dr. Sihler pointed to the Christ-child in the manger and to the parable of the mustard-seed as illustrations of the way in which the great works of God are begun. The illustrations were apt; for the power of Christ and His Word went forth to the American Lutheran Church through the deliberations and resolutions of that memorable convention. The election of officers for the new synod resulted as follows: Pastor C. F. W. Walther, President; Dr. W. Sihler, Vice-President; Pastor F. W. Husmann, Secretary; Mr. F. W. Barthel, Treasurer.

The infant Synod of Missouri had been born, and men began to ask, "What manner of child shall this be?"

MODERNISM IN THE PROTESTANT CHURCHES.

During the late Lenten season, St. Louis was strangely stirred by a public arraignment of heretical tendencies in the teachings permitted in some of the local Protestant churches. This arraignment brought about a counter-arraignment of the adherents of orthodoxy for medievalism and traditionalism. One of the incidents of this unusual, but, we doubt not, God-sent disturbance began at the Maplewood Methodist church. The pastor, Dr. Lichliter, considered it opportune to define his doctrinal position, which he did in a sermon on "Modernism." After sketching the history of the Modernist movement in the Church of Rome, he proceeded to say:—

With this more technical phase of Modernism we have nothing to do to-night. In the popular sense Modernism is characteristic of the progressive movement in all communions. It has been described by a prominent English scholar as the shape which religion takes in the mind of the modern as distinct from the medieval man. It is, in reality, an attempt to re-express the great fundamental realities of religion in terms of modern life. In the English-speaking world this movement has been shaping itself and gathering strength since the publication of "Essays and Reviews," in 1860. It has recognized as its allies the new scientific method, the new psychology, the modern

emphasis on sociology, the new interest in the study of comparative religions, and the modern conception of the democratic ideals. Speaking generally, it may be said that in doctrine, Modernism stands for the freedom of the individual conscience and the absence of dogmatic tests. It believes in a creed, but insists that the creed be personal, positive, short, vital, and that it should function in modern life. In the social order, Modernism stands for democracy. Its great word is not charity, but justice; its goal is the establishment of the ideals of brotherhood, the kingdom of God on earth. In the church, the Modernist may sometimes be heterodox, but he is not heretical. He is often insurgent, but he is not a rebel.

It is time that the message and spirit of the Modernist be understood. He is a factor to be reckoned with in every church and in every community. He believes profoundly in his mission and in his message. The real distinction between the Modernist and the Traditionalist is not one of doctrine, but of method. And more deeply still, it is a difference in attitude of mind. The Traditionalist stands for authority; the Modernist for freedom. The one looks to the past to find his theology; the other is conscious of an ever-growing apprehension of truth. The editor of *The Biblical World* has admirably phrased the distinction: "It is not dogma that is most offensive to the modern mind; it is the finishedness and fixedness of dogma, incongruous with a view of the world in which nothing is finished, and therefore nothing should be fixed." The Modernist, therefore, keeps his face toward the sunrise, and is always willing to accept new truth when it dawns upon the world.

The spirit of the Modernist is often misrepresented. He is sometimes called an "infidel." It is represented that he is seeking to disrupt the Church. His teachings are often regarded as being destructive of faith. There are not wanting those who would eject him from the Church on the ground of that great word of Paul's, "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers." To all this the Modernist makes no reply. He is too busy getting his work done to stop for recriminations. He feels that there should be room enough in the Church of Jesus Christ for men of varying shades of opinion. He is eager to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. In a deep sense he is evangelical. He would, as Paul suggests, become all things to all men if thereby he might win some. He asks only that his life and his work be subjected to practical and not to theoretical tests. Is it easier or harder for men to believe in Christ because of him? Does he actually bring men to discipleship to Jesus and inspire them with a zeal for social service? Do the boys and girls in the high schools and the young people in

the universities find religion more credible or less credible because of his teaching?

Such, then, is the Modernist. What is his attitude toward the Bible? Is he destructive or constructive? He has been called a "higher critic," whatever that may mean, and has been pictured as "tearing the Bible to pieces." In view of all this, his attitude ought to be defined. Let it be acknowledged at once that he cannot stand for the infallibility of the Bible as that term is ordinarily understood. But this dissent he holds in common with many of the men who represent official orthodoxy. He believes that God reveals Himself through natural process as well as through what has been called the miraculous. And he believes that even through the imperfect and the transient in the Bible God has spoken to men. He calmly accepts the fact of error in the Bible and is not alarmed. He is concerned with its central message—not with an infinity of detail. If he does not call the Bible "the Word of God," it is because of a supreme reverence. To him the Word of God is Christ and not a book. Within the Bible, however, he finds the perfect revelation of this Word of God, and that for him is the supreme standard, the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

The Modernist is not afraid of Biblical criticism. He welcomes every fresh investigation, knowing that at the last the essential truth in the book will stand forth in imperishable beauty. He, therefore, is not inclined to attack the scholarship of the world, which has been busy with a study of the book. He has no mechanical theory of inspiration which is endangered by the application of scientific methods. He is anxious only for facts, and is patient with all revisions of opinion.

When the question is asked, Do you believe the Bible is divine? he answers, Try it! The ultimate test of the Bible is practical. The ultimate proof is in experience. If a part of the Bible satisfies his spiritual yearnings, if it is as bread to a hungry soul, it is God's Word to him. If he reads another part of the Bible and finds in it no message, he simply passes it by to find pastures where the grass is green and the waters satisfy the thirsty soul. The finest tribute paid to Modernism recently was in the words of Prof. Sell in connection with the excommunication of Pastor Carl Jatho of Cologne. Dr. Sell said: "The liberals are using the Bible more honestly than the conservatives. They are more truthfully setting forth the ideas which were held by the Biblical men. They are discovering the religion of the Bible more accurately and are drawing from this an inspiration for service which is positive and constructive." If "infidels" are doing this sort of thing for the world, then may their tribe increase.

It is not difficult, from these statements, to assign to Dr. Lichliter his proper place, *viz.*, with the forces which negative and subvert the fundamentals of the old faith, and make the essence of Christianity to consist in "social uplift," "moral improvement," "ethical culture," etc.

Dr. Lichliter's statements were given publicity in a manner that strongly attracted attention in the secular press of St. Louis. It was, therefore, eminently proper and timely that in one of his Lenten discourses Pastor Hemmeter, of Bethlehem Lutheran Church, administered a rebuke to "Modernism" of the Protestant species, from which we quote the following:—

"But what is this Modernism really? In this country it is largely the echo of passing schools of Modernism in Germany. There, in the cradle of the Reformation, the Church has been largely disturbed by another generation of so-called Professors of Theology who, mistaking their calling, considered it incumbent upon themselves to revive the recurring errors of the ages and to set the Church aright according to their own evanescent evolutions of supposed truth. Germany has largely tired of these schools and has passed to further ground, or else, aroused by the issue of these schools, namely, unbelief and religious bankruptcy, is turning again to the simple Bible truth. And now it remains for us in this country to be regaled with the discarded dish of the Old World, revamped with an additional sauce of arrogance.

"Modernists, strictly speaking, have been in the world from the beginning. The precept that God gave in Eden: 'Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat, but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,' was to man a revelation from his Maker, that is, dogma pure and simple. The Modernist of that day came and said, 'Hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?' And again, 'Ye shall not surely die; for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye

shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.' There we have the original Modernist. And there in his first pronunciamento are all the essentials of the Modernism of all times, to-wit: contradiction of the clear Word of God, the suggestion of a better life apart from, and different from, the divine way, and the promise, 'Ye shall be as gods,' by means of a transgression which separates from the only true God.

"What our Modernists will not understand is this, that a little outside polish will not make a real Christian. It is immeasurably easier to produce a whited sepulcher than to produce a living temple. The Modernist in careless indifference neglects this fact and recommends a Christian of the fig leaf pride. Christ's word, 'Ye must be born again,' the Modernist decries as dogma and as unbearable. The claim of the Savior, 'I am the Way, and the Truth, and the Life: no man cometh unto the Father but by me,' does not fit into his system, and he therefore rejects it. It is dogma, mark the word!

"To the Modernist, Jesus is only a man, and no Savior at all. To the Modernist, as Carl Jatho of Cologne, of whom a local minister, according to our local press, seems to be proud, has said, Jesus is but 'a God-seeker like unto us, though one of the most successful.' In a letter to his friend Harnack, who had disavowed him, this Modernist Jatho wrote: 'We are both of the opinion that Jesus was a man, and thereby we differentiate ourselves from those who with the teaching of the Church say: No, He was more than a man. The Church's teaching in its final consequence leads to the conception of the divinity of Christ. Our perception, on the contrary, forces us to relinquish conceding to the person of Jesus any absolute importance.'

"Such, then, is Modernism. The entire Christian religion of a Savior born in Bethlehem who is Christ the Lord; of a Messiah who was wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities, by whose stripes we are healed; of the Son of God, whom God gave to be lifted up that whosoever believeth in Him might not perish, but have everlasting life;

of the Son of Man who shall come again to judge the quick and the dead, and before whom every knee shall bow and confess that Jesus is Lord over all—all this is by Modernism cast aside as out of date, and Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever, is to the Modernist a discarded dream.

“And withal, the Modernist dares to pose as a Christian minister. He dares to stand up in Christian pulpits and tell us that he and his kind stand for ‘justice’ rather than for ‘charity;’ that their ideal is ‘brotherhood;’ that they are eager to keep the ‘unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace;’ that they ask only that their ‘life’ and their ‘work’ be subjected to practical and not to theoretical tests; that they are anxious for the ‘facts’ and are ‘patient with all revisions of opinion.’

“We ask in the name of common, practical honesty and decency: Why do these men hold Christian pulpits? Is there any ‘justice’ in their claim for ‘charity’ when, denying the Christ, the historical, Biblical Christ, they usurp, and in many cases stealthily, the leadership of congregations gathered under the confession of the Christ whom they deny? Of what sort is their ‘brotherhood’ when they deny Him who said: ‘One is your Master; all ye are brethren,’ and again, ‘I am the Vine, ye are the branches’? Of what sort is their ‘unity of the Spirit’ when they discard the ‘Spirit of Christ’ who teaches men to ‘call Jesus Lord’? Of what sort is that ‘life’ which the Modernist commends when, bearing the name of Christian, he brings shame upon the cross of Christ? Of what sort is that ‘work’ which, like the serpent of old, slinks into the garden of the Church and perverts the truth? Why, we ask?

“We ask, why? This is a land of religious liberty. Why do these Modernists not erect pulpits of their own? Why do they not go out on the highways and byways and gather flocks? Why do they not go out into heathen lands and lay down their lives for their conception of the truth? But that is not their way.

“The Modernist cries against Dogma. And yet, it is

dogma, that is, the preaching of the doctrine that Jesus is the Christ, the Savior of the world from sin, death, and the devil, that has established the churches that give homes and rostrums now to these Modernists. The dogma, that is, the doctrine that Jesus is the Light of the world, the Truth, and the Way to the heavenly Father, has Christianized the world.

"What has the Modernist done for suffering mankind? Where are his missions, his churches, his seminaries, his colleges, his hospitals, his orphans' and old people's homes? Where? Where, except there where they have succeeded to reap where they have not sown?

"And now the Modernist tells us there is unrest in the churches, that the churches are not well filled. And this he tells us is the result of dogma.

"We answer, Should there not be unrest where the Modernist is so busy troubling the waters? And on the other hand we point to the actual fact which refutes the Modernist, namely, this: All over the land the Christian churches are best filled in this season of Lent when the 'Old, old story of Jesus and His love' is proclaimed in its greatest fullness. The Gospel, the dogma of Christ crucified, is even to-day the power of God unto salvation unto every one that believeth. And besides, we rejoice to know, and the voices are loud on every side, that men, real men, are growing weary of the silly claims of a 'superior learning,' and of a 'more advanced ground,' and of 'scientific methods,' and of the 'results of science.' The indefiniteness and the changeableness of the vociferations of the criers of Modernism is dawning more and more on the consciousness of long-suffering hearers, and they are beginning to ask for bread instead of stone.

"But the Church of Christ, the Son of God, will prevail, even against the gates of hell. Christ crucified will be preached to the end of days, to the Jews a stumbling-block and to the Greeks foolishness, and Christians will never be ashamed of the Gospel of Christ."

THE PROOF TEXTS OF THE CATECHISM WITH A PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.

THE SECOND ARTICLE.

(The Conclusion.)

Luke 1, 74. 75: *That we, being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, might serve Him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before Him, all the days of our life.*

The *Song of Zacharias*, Luke 1, 68—79, is commonly called the *Benedictus*, because in the Latin version the first word of the hymn, *Εὐλογητός*, is rendered *benedictus* = blessed, praised. The *Benedictus* is a prophecy inspired by the Holy Ghost, v. 67. The first part, vv. 68—75, contains a praise unto God for the salvation prepared by the Messiah as foretold by the holy prophets of the Old Testament, v. 70. The Deliverer is at hand, but Zacharias with prophetic foresight views all the precious promises made to the fathers and to be fulfilled in Him as already completed. He speaks in the past tense: "Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel, because He *looked upon* and *wrought redemption*, *ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν*, for His people."

"Our enemies," devil, sin, death, in whose hands we were, held us fast with a relentless grip. Slaves we were to these masters, Eph. 2, 1; and the wages? That of enemies bent on our destruction: death, damnation! And from this awful servitude we could not free ourselves. This the Messiah did. He "*delivered us out of their hand.*" This work of deliverance, this work of *salvation*, vv. 69. 71, was also one of *redemption*, v. 68. A price was paid. Which? "The Son of Man came . . . to give *His life* a ransom, *λύτρον*, for many," Matt. 20, 28. We were bought with a price; thus we were saved. Now He is our Lord, and we are His own and live under Him in His kingdom. O the blessed change! Formerly we lived in Satan's kingdom, now we live in Christ's kingdom, in the kingdom of grace, endowed with spiritual life

here, and life eternal to come. This is the first and foremost fruit of Christ's redemptive work—salvation. But as subjects in His blessed kingdom it behooves us to *serve* our God and King. This also is a fruit of His work. And liberated slaves of that hard taskmaster, the devil, that we are, how gladly, how joyously should we not serve our Liberator! 1. As to the *manner* of this service: "*without fear we should serve Him*," our Lord and God. "*Without fear*" from our former masters and tyrants; they are vanquished, they can harm us none. In the daily walks of our life, whether we be father, mother, daughter, son, master, servant, we are to perform the works of our calling "not with eye-service, as men-pleasers, but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart," Eph. 6, 6. — 2. As to its *nature*: we are to serve God *in holiness and righteousness* (cf. Eph. 4, 24). Clothed in the garb of Christ's holiness and righteousness, we Christians are holy and righteous in God's sight, and as such the new man in us is to assert himself more and more in our conversation towards God and our fellow-men. 3. As to its *duration*: it is to be a constant, persevering service; it is to last "*all the days of our life*."

2 Cor. 5, 15: *He died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him which died for them and rose again.*

"*He (Christ) died for all.*" "*For all*" = *in the place of, in the stead of*, is the only correct translation of the phrase *ὕπὲρ πάντων*, the *ὕπὲρ* being synonymous with *ἀντί*, since text and context manifestly proclaim the truth of Christ's death being a substitutionary death. — "*Christ died for all.*" What sentiment does this knowledge of Christ's vicarious substitution generate in the hearts of the believers? Under what obligation are they? "*That (ὅτι) they who live should not henceforth live unto themselves,*" live for selfish ends, but they should dedicate their whole life to the service of Him "*who died for them and rose again.*"

THE THIRD ARTICLE.

THE PERSON OF THE HOLY GHOST.

Divine names, divine attributes, divine worship, divine works, are ascribed to the Holy Ghost; hence He is true God.

Matt. 28, 19: *Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*

This text, which is a conclusive proof for the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity, is for that very reason a decisive proof for the Holy Ghost's being a person distinct from the Father and the Son. The command reads: "*Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*" Observe the singular noun: *name*, εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, not εἰς τὰ ὀνόματα. By Father, Son, and Holy Ghost but *one* God is named; there is but *one* essence, undivided and indivisible, but in three *distinct* Persons. The Holy Ghost is not, as some heretics taught and still teach, simply a divine power, a divine energy, but a *distinct* person, the Third Person in the Holy Trinity. — Another lucid text is John 14, 16, 17, where our Savior says: "*And I (Christ) will pray the Father*" (i. e., a different person from Himself, the Son), "*and He shall give you another Comforter*" (i. e., God the Holy Ghost, another, different person), "*that He may be with you forever, even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive,*" etc. This text, too, clearly teaches that the Holy Ghost is a person distinct from the Father and the Son, and applies the personal pronoun "He" to Him. — The Unitarians will not see this; their high intellectual culture does not admit of such an unintelligent belief! They follow their blind reason; we "bring into captivity every thought unto the obedience of Christ," 2 Cor. 10, 5.

1 Cor. 3, 16: *Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?*

The "*and*" connecting the two clauses is the so-called explanatory "*and*," equivalent in meaning to "*because*." The

rhetorical question, "*Know ye not,*" etc., appeals forcibly to the Christian consciousness of the Corinthians, and reminds them of an important truth they had been taught, but which, as their conduct implied, they had ignored, forgotten. Which is that truth? Christians, "*ye are the temple,*" the sanctuary, "*of God.*" Why? Because "*the Spirit of God,*" i. e., the Holy Spirit, "*dwelleth in you.*" The indwelling of the *Holy Spirit* made them a temple of God. Clearly the indwelling of the Holy Spirit and that of God is one; the two names are used interchangeably: *the Holy Spirit is God.*—That is the important truth taught here directly. But observe also the implied truths pertinent to the matter in hand. "*To dwell*" is an act attributable to a person only; hence the Holy Spirit is a *person*. Again, His indwelling converts man into "*a temple of God.*" This suggests His work of sanctification and renovation.

Acts 5, 3. 4: *Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.*

Ananias's heart was not right before God. He cared neither for the good pleasure of God nor for the welfare of the poor. As Barnabas had laid the full price of the field at the apostles' feet for the benefit of the poor, so Ananias pretended to do the same. He craved honor before men, but sordidly stingy as he was, he kept back part of the money received for the possession, simulating that he had given all. Ananias was a hypocrite and a liar. Satan was his master. Peter discloses his grievous sin to him, saying: *Thou hast lied to the Holy Ghost and thereby thou hast lied unto God.*—The Holy Ghost is God.—This passage also teaches that the Holy Ghost is a *person*. You cannot lie to an "energy" or to a "power," but to a person only. Ananias is said to have *lied* to the Holy Ghost, hence the Holy Ghost is a person.

Ps. 33, 6: *By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath (Spirit) of His mouth.*

By appropriation the work of creation is ascribed to God the Father, but being an *opus ad extra*, an external work, all three persons of the Godhead concurred in it. — In our passage, creation is ascribed to the Holy Ghost, thus proving that He is God.

"By the word of the Lord," the only-begotten Son of the Father, Eph. 3, 9; Col. 1, 15. 16; Hebr. 1, 2, *"were the heavens made; and all the host of them,"* the sun, the moon, the myriads of stars, *"by the breath of His mouth,"* by the Holy Spirit. — Gen. 1, 2 we read: "And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters," and Job 33, 4 we read: "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life."

Ps. 139, 7—10: *Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from Thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold, Thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall Thy hand lead me, and Thy right hand shall hold me.*

Omnipresence is an essential attribute of God. Whosoever is omnipresent is God. The text teaches the omnipresence of the Holy Spirit, *ergo* He is God.

The two members of the topic sentence are substantially parallel in thought and have the force of rhetorical interrogations: *"Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from Thy presence?"* The answer is obvious. No flight can remove me from Thy presence; Thou art everywhere. Personally, the psalmist has no desire to flee from the presence of God. Thrilled by that majestic attribute, his purpose is rather to magnify God the Holy Spirit's omnipresence. Vivid, striking pictures set forth the utter impossibility of escape, thus bringing the thought into bold relief: "Thou (whole and entire) art there!" He imagines himself taking a flight into heaven, of making his bed in hell; he thinks of passing through the universe from the extreme east to the extreme west with

the swiftness of the morning ray, yet: "Thou art there!" "Thy hand leads me;" "Thy right hand holds me." Heaven, hell, earth—all filled by the presence of the Holy Spirit.

1 Cor. 2, 10: *The Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.*

Omnipresence and omniscience are closely interrelated.

1 Cor. 2, 10 teaches the *omniscience* of the Holy Spirit.

The apostle speaks of "the wisdom of God in a mystery," v. 7, of the mystery that "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him," v. 9, *i. e.*, the glad Gospel tidings. This hidden wisdom "God ordained before the world unto our glory," v. 7, a mystery "which none of the princes of this world knew," v. 8. No creature knew it, could know it; it was a knowledge only God possessed. To come into possession of this mystery God must reveal it to us. This He did. How? "By His Spirit." "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," 2 Pet. 1, 21. So the Spirit knows the mysteries God only knows. His knowledge and God's knowledge are identical; the Spirit is omniscient, is God. Why does the Spirit know these things? "The Spirit searcheth *all* things;" He is all-knowing; nothing is hidden from Him. Yea, He searcheth "the deep things of God," the inmost things, the infinite depths of the mysteries of God. The next verse, by an *argumentum a minore ad majus*, emphasizes this same truth—the omniscience of the Holy Spirit—and proves His Godhead: "For which man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God."

Is. 6, 3: *Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full of His glory.*

"The service of the seraphs is now more closely described. Above all, their service consists in praising and glorifying God. Arranged in two choirs, the seraphs hover around the throne

of God, and the two choirs chant in antiphon. The prophet hears them cry to each other: 'Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts.' This is a true service of God, so well-pleasing in His sight; this, indeed, is praising God, when the creatures acknowledge and confess with a loud voice that God is God, that God is holy, etc. The heavenly hosts praise and glorify the Lord Sabaoth, the Lord of hosts, the Creator of the spirits, the Creator and Ruler of all things. The holy angels confess that the Lord is holy, holy in an infinitely higher degree and sense than that in which they themselves are holy. God is holy, set apart, put at a distance from, infinitely exalted not only above the sin of men, but above all creatures. The thrice-repeated Holy, the Trisagion, not only reinforces the concept holiness, but suggests, as modern exegetes also acknowledge, the mystery of the Holy Trinity. In God there are three persons, and the one person is God, is holy, in the same measure as are the others. In this song of the seraphs the Church has at all times recognized a *hymnus trinitatis*." (Stoeckhardt, *Jesaias*.)

1 Cor. 6, 11: *But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God.*

In the preceding verse, the apostle had enumerated a horrible catalogue of vices practiced in that godless city of Corinth. He proceeds: *καὶ τὰυτὰ ἦτε* = "*And these things*" = "such a set," "such stuff" (Meyer) "*some of you were.*" You were, i. e., it is a thing of the past; thank God, a change has been wrought in you. To accentuate this wonderful change and to bring the great contrast between then and now into strong relief, the apostle emphatically repeats the "but" three times. "*But ye are washed,*" ἀπελούσασθε. The prefix ἀπο = off, intensifies the idea of the verb, hence the meaning is: ye are *thoroughly* washed, ye are washed *clean*. Through the forgiveness obtained in baptism, "the washing of regeneration," you have been washed clean from the filth of sin, for Christ

has cleansed the Church "with the washing of water by the Word," Eph. 5, 26. Being thus cleansed from sin, ye are put in intimate relation with God, "*ye are sanctified,*" i. e., separated from the world, taken out of the *massa perditionis*, and consecrated to God. "*Ye are justified.*" Your guilt of sin has been removed, by imputation of the merits of Christ, apprehended by faith, you are declared righteous before God. Thus the state of grace of the Corinthian Christians is described.

How was this change effected? "*In the name of the Lord Jesus.*" The ground of their being washed clean by baptism, of their justification and sanctification, is the redemptive work of Christ. The name *Jesus* means Savior. In Him they believe, and thus He is their *Lord*, He having bought them with a price. Thus they were saved; for there is no other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved but that of Jesus. But who brought them to this faith? The Holy Spirit. Hence the last phrase reads: "*and by the Spirit of our God.*" It is He who through the Gospel applies, imparts, communicates to individuals all that is implied in that blessed name—Jesus, Savior. It was the Holy Spirit that brought both the apostle and the Corinthian Christians to faith so that the apostle can write: "*and the Spirit of our God.*"

Springfield, Ill.

LOUIS WESSEL.

(To be continued.)

OUR NEW ENGLISH HYMN-BOOK.¹⁾

While the English Synod of Missouri was discussing the advisability and feasibility of organic union with the German Missouri Synod, a great work was quietly being done for it which was destined to affect, in a perceptible manner, the public

1) *Evangelical Lutheran Hymn-Book with Tunes*. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 538 pages. Price: Edition T. C., bound in handsome silk cloth and with stained edges, \$1.50. Edition T. H., half morocco, otherwise as above, \$2.00.

worship and private devotions of its members. At its final convention in St. Louis the Synod's Hymn-Book Committee reported that it had finished its work, and "that the Hymnal is in the hands of the printer." With this committee another, the Hymn-Book Finance Committee, had been cooperating, and this committee reported that it had received 4,802 advance subscriptions for the new hymnal—enough to almost exhaust the first edition; that it had received \$3,224.65, had expended \$1,821.50, had outstanding accounts for unpaid subscriptions to the amount of \$728.75,—all of which showed that the financial side of the enterprise had been sufficiently safeguarded.

In the mean time, the contemplated union with the German Synod was effected, and in the adjustment of the former English Synod's business affairs, notably the transfer of its publication concern to the German Synod, the latter body took over all the assets and liabilities of the English body. The new hymnal, therefore, by the logic of events becomes the hymnal of the entire Missouri Synod. We have deemed this event of sufficient importance to publish it in the form of an article rather than in a book-review.

A revision of the confessional and devotional standards of a church society is never an easy, often a perilous, task. It touches the forms in which the spiritual life of Christians has been wont to seek expression. It arrays personal sentiment—that awful factor in the settlement of how things ought, or ought not, to be—and habits grown venerable through long usage, against itself. Conservatism, accordingly, in a church society will invariably advise against revision, assuming, on the one hand, that existing defects are more easily borne than the annoyance which a complete readjustment to suit the new conditions necessitates, and on the other hand, that innovation rarely spells improvement. Thus the revisers' task becomes a thankless one, and not infrequently subjects them to unfair criticism. Special commendation, therefore, is due whenever a work of revision, or reconstruction, is well done.

The magnitude of the change from the old to the new English hymnal is seen, first, in the relative size of the two books. The new book retains all the liturgical forms for use at the various public services on particular Sundays, festive¹ days, and extraordinary occasions that were found in the old book. In this part there is no change whatever. But in the hymnal proper there is considerable change. The number of hymns has grown from 451 (we count Doxology No. 18 in the old book as a hymn, which it really is and as which it is rightly treated in the new book) to 567. But the difference between these two figures does not represent all the new material that has been embodied in the new book; for 17 of the old hymns have been dropped, Hymn 281 which, through some oversight was printed twice in the old book (see No. 410) has been printed only once; and if we leave out of our computation Doxology No. 18, we have a total of 135 new hymns in the present hymnal.

We turn our attention, secondly, to the character of the omissions and additions. We miss in the new hymnal Newton's closing hymn: "May the grace of Christ, our Savior" (No. 9), Montgomery's hymn for the dedication of a church: "Lord of hosts, to Thee we raise" (No. 159), Barbauld's Gospel call: "Come, said Jesus' sacred voice" (No. 191), Sarah Flower Adams's "Nearer, my God, to Thee" (No. 357), Watts's "Our God, our Help in ages past" (No. 383), Caswall's "Days and moments quickly flying" (No. 401), Doddridge's "Thrice happy souls, who, born of heaven" (No. 439), and Wesley's "Lamb of God, I look to Thee" (No. 441). The absence of these hymns, which never were indigenous to Lutheran soil, we consider no loss, though they may not have been discarded for that reason. The new book affords ample compensation in the better hymns substituted for those dropped.

But there are omissions which will be viewed with some regret. They are translations of favorite German hymns, *viz.*, of Luther's "Was fuercht'st du, Feind Herodes, sehr" (No. 52), "Jesus Christus, unser Heiland, der den Tod ueberwand," in

Bacon's rendering (No. 95), Massie's renderings of "Jesaja, dem Propheten, das geschah" (No. 130), of the Te Deum (No. 318), of "Mitten wir im Leben sind" (No. 384), of "Verleih uns Frieden gnaediglich" (No. 152). Also Heyl's rendering of Zinzendorf's "Jesu, geh voran!" (No. 435) and Miss Winkworth's rendering of Henrietta von Hayn's "Weil ich Jesu Schaefflein bin" (No. 440) have been dropped. The hymn last named, we think, is found in the *Sunday School Hymnal*. In the place of the rendering of Luther's "Was fuercht'st du, Feind Herodes, sehr" we have Neale's rendering of the medieval "Herodes, hostis impie," in "The star proclaims the King is here," and for Heyl's rendering of Zinzendorf's hymn that of Jane Borthwick has been substituted, which is a great improvement over Heyl's (*e. g.*: "as through life we glide"!). The difficulty which a modern congregation encounters in singing the tunes for some of Luther's hymns, composed for the rhythmic singing of his time, may account for the discarding of the rest of the hymns before noted.

There is, however, ample compensation provided by the admission into the new hymn-book of the following translations which were not in the old, *viz.*, Crull's rendering of the Countess von Schwarzburg's "Bis hieher hat mich Gott gebracht;" Rim-bach's renderings of v. Birken's "Lasset uns mit Jesu ziehen" and of Flittner's "Jesu, meines Herzens Freud' ;" Miss Winkworth's renderings of Horn's "Gottes Sohn ist kommen," of Meinhold's "Guter Hirt, Du hast gestillt," of Franck's "HErr, ich habe missgehandelt," of Oelschlaeger's "Troestet, troestet, meine Lieben," of Schmolck's "Tut mir auf die schoene Pforte" and "Willkommen, Held, im Streite," and of Werner's "Wir danken dir, HErr Jesu Christ;" Miss Cox's rendering of Gellert's "Jesus lebt, mit ihm auch ich;" Miss Claudia Hernanman's rendering of Mohr's "Heil'ger Geist, erhoer' uns;" Jane Borthwick's rendering of Schmolck's "Mein Jesu, wie du willst;" Frothingham's translations of "Was Gott tut, das ist wohlgetan," according to a tune from the *Erfurt Enchiridion* of 1527, and a good translation of Speratus's "Es ist das Heil

uns kommen her." The last hymn alone balances the loss of many of the discarded hymns. — The new hymn-book contains 219 translations of standard German hymns, to 210 translations contained in the old book. About 39 per cent. of the entire contents of the new book is from standard Lutheran hymn-writers. — Besides the translations noted, we find in the new hymnal Chandler's rendering of the ancient "*Angularis fundamentum*" ("Christ is our Corner-stone"), Neale's version of *Urbs beata Hierusalem* ("Christ, Thou art the sure Foundation"), and the rendering from the Ohio *Lutheran Hymnal* of *Christe cunctorum Dominator alme* ("Eternal Son of God, O Thou"). The monk of Cluny, Bernhard de Morlaix, sings his *Hic breve vivitur, hic breve plangitur, hic breve fletur*, in this book in Neale's "Brief life is here our portion;" and Savonarola's *Giesu sommo conforto* reappears in Jane Frances Wilde's "Jesus, Refuge of the Weary." Modern hymns we find in Bethune's "It is not death to die," which reproduces Caesar Malan's "Non, ce n'est pas mourir;" and in John Olaf Wallin's Communion hymn ("The death of Jesus Christ the Lord we celebrate"), which is a reproduction of an old hymn by the third archbishop of Upsala, Haquin Spegel. Also Landstad's "A slumber I know in Jesus' name" is of Scandinavian origin.

It will not be necessary for formulating our verdict on the new English hymnal to examine separately every one of the more than hundred new hymns that remain to be mentioned. We note that American hymn-writers in our church have been recognized in this book by the admission of Cronenwett's "We have a sure prophetic Word," Loy's "The Law of God is good and wise," "The Gospel shows the Father's grace," and "When Rome had shrouded earth in night," and Jacobs's "Nearer, my God, to Thee." Of the new hymns William Walsham How, Bishop of Wakefield, has been made to contribute seven, Christopher Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln, six, Chas. Wesley four, Frances Rider Havergal, James Montgomery, the Moravian, John Ellerton, the chaplain to

Lord Crewe, Isaac Watts, the favorite British hymn-writer, and the Irish rector John Samuel Bewley Monsell, three hymns each. Among the authors from whose poems selections have been made are Thomas Haweis, once physician at Truro, then chaplain to Lady Huntingdon, Charlotte and Julia Elliott, Ray Palmer, Dorothy Bloomfield, Mrs. Irons, Horatio Bonar, etc. Every one of the new selections is a gem of sacred song that has long become the cherished property of Christians singing at their devotions in English. The work of selecting and compiling these hymns has throughout been performed with that respectful consideration which believes that only the very best is worth offering to a church which has been long blessed with a wealth of spiritual songs. We cordially commend the good judgment and the chastened esthetical sense of the unknown committee which has performed this arduous task.

The change from the old to the new hymnal appears, thirdly, in its most striking form in the topical arrangement of the hymns. Here a veritable revolution has taken place. Not a single one of the old hymns retained, *e. g.*, could be found according to the old numeration. Everything appears differently grouped and differently placed. When we think of the pastor grown gray in the service and in the "giving out" of the hymns, or of the layman whose daily companion, next to the Bible and the Catechism, the old hymn-book has been, and who know by heart that No. 74 is "O bleeding Head," No. 193 "Delay not," No. 301 "Now rest beneath night's shadows," etc., and that the hymns on the work of Christ are about in the center of the book, morning and evening hymns come after the hymns relating to a Christian's conduct, and similar details on which a habituated memory is apt to act by a sort of instinct,—I say, when all this is considered, one anticipates a shock among the users of the old book when they begin to use the new. It was a heroic committee that attempted this thoroughgoing change; and the question can only be, Was the committee's courage balanced by wisdom?

The change in question was effected along two lines: 1) the

better understanding of the leading thought, hence, of the topical character, of certain hymns has led to their being differently grouped. *E. g.*, "All glory be to God on high," which had been treated in the old book as a hymn of invocation to be used at the regular Sunday service, now is grouped with the hymns to the Trinity; "Come, let us join our cheerful songs," and "In the cross of Christ I glory," formerly classified with the Lenten hymns, now are grouped with the hymns to the Redeemer. The Lenten hymn "Not all the blood of beasts" becomes a hymn of "Faith and Justification," etc. Exception might be taken as to some of the new classifications, but, when all changes under this head have been sufficiently pondered, it will have to be confessed that the committee's judgment has been correct in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred. Some of the hymns given a different grouping have actually gained in suggestiveness and importance because of this grouping, *e. g.*, "Christ, Thou the Champion of the band who own," which is a Reformation hymn in the new book.

2) The sequence of the topical divisions has been changed, and some of the larger divisions have been subdivided. The new book presents, first, what we might call "Sunday hymns," relating to the beginning and close of worship (1—18); secondly, "Week-day hymns," embracing morning and evening hymns (19—45); thirdly, hymns embodying the leading elements of a Christian's devotion, such as the Gospel Invitation, Praise, the Redeemer, God's Word, and the Lord's Day (46—109). The fourth division embraces hymns arranged for the festival seasons of the Church, from Advent to Thanksgiving. This division has been especially enriched in the sections for the Harvest Home, All Saints, or Apostles' and Martyrs' Days, and the "National Day of Humiliation and Prayer" section (110—305). The fifth division is dedicated to the leading truths of the *ordo salutis*: justification and sanctification. The hymns on sanctification are aptly subdivided (306—389). The sixth division embraces hymns on the six parts of the Catechism, with special hymns for confir-

mation, marriage, the home, family, and children (390—449). The seventh division exhibits the Church in her activities, the relation among its members and its glory; it is exceptionally rich in mission hymns (450—493). The eighth division is inscribed, as in the old book, "Cross and Comfort" (494—526), and the concluding division is eschatological (527—567).

The logic of the new sequence of topics is apparent. It follows a natural line of thought, and thus will facilitate our mental readjustment to the new order of things.

En passant, we might mention that some hymns which were incomplete in the old book have been completed in the new, *e. g.*, "Jesus, Thy blood and righteousness," which gains four stanzas in the new book that were not in the old. Other hymns have been abridged, *e. g.*, the Advent hymn: "Arise, sons of the kingdom," which loses vv. 3. 6. 7, and 10. Also the phraseology has been changed in a number of places: "Thou Sabaoth strong" becomes "strong Lord of hosts" (comp. 303 with 30, v. 10); "Let no ill dream disturb my rest, No power of darkness me molest" becomes "Sleep that may me more vigorous make, To serve my God when I awake" (comp. 298 with 36, v. 4), etc., etc.

At the end, an attempt has been made to restore the ancient chant to its former place and dignity in the public worship of the Church, and the section of doxologies has been revised.

The festivals of the Church with their respective pericopal lessons, Bible lessons for morning and evening reading throughout the year, and directions how and when to use the Psalms are appended, and exhaustive indexes conclude the book.

On the music offered in the edition with tunes we are not in a position to express a competent opinion, but we were favorably impressed with the many familiar German tunes in which the new *Hymn-Book with Tunes* abounds.

That a great deal of judicious work has been expended in the preparation of this book is evident also from the hymno-

logical references, stating the authorship of the hymns and tunes. In many cases these references correct erroneous statements in the old book.

The book having now been fully launched upon its mission, it remains for the Church to reap the benefits of the faithful labors of the authors. In our judgment the book will help to make our English services more beautiful, more impressive, and more expressive of the Lutheran ideal of divine worship, which has in all ages breathed a peculiar spirit of loyal reverence mingled with awe, and borne up with a spiritual joy and gratitude which is all the more pleasing because of its chastened and subdued utterance.

CURRENT EVENTS.

AN UNUSUALLY LONG and singularly blessed pastorate came to a close when Rev. J. H. Schroeder of St. John's, San Francisco, Cal., died April 16. He had been assigned to this charge upon his graduation from Concordia, St. Louis, in 1886, and it was the only one he ever served.

THE RESERVE AND CALMNESS of Christian faith is expressed in these words of Rev. John H. C. Fritz, who, writing in *The Lutheran Witness* concerning the *Titanic* disaster, says:—

"It is not for us to pass judgment upon the 1,600 souls who went to their watery grave in mid-ocean, when the *Titanic* 'sank as lead in the mighty waters.' God has already judged them. Those who put their trust in God and their Savior have lost nothing. They have gained immensely; they are now with their God, and are forever spared all the misery of sin in this evil world, and are delivered from all disease which would also in course of time have cut off them from the earth. Those who had become hardened in their sins and who had persistently despised the grace of God, spurning His love and refusing to be at peace with God, have been overtaken by God's righteous anger and stern justice. They have no reason for murmuring against their God; they are reaping the evil fruits of their evil sowing, and must suffer in the place prepared for Satan and his angels."

REV. SCHROTH OF MAYVILLE, WIS., communicates the following from *Harper's Weekly* for March 30, which requires no gloss nor comment either to make its meaning plain or to increase its impressiveness:—

“AS TO CARDINALS.

“Marconi Wireless Dispatch to the *Sun*.

“Rome, via Glace Bay, March 21. — Major Archibald Butt, *aide-de-camp* to President Taft, accompanied by Bishop Kennedy, rector of the American College here, had an audience with the Pope to-day, and presented a letter from President Taft thanking the Pontiff for the creation of three new American cardinals. The President wrote that this action was acceptable to Americans irrespective of their faith, as Catholicism contributes to the welfare of the country.”—

“Well, well! Supposing all that is true, whom is our President speaking for?

“Not altogether for us, certainly.

“It is not as our President that he sends his aide to thank the Holy Father for making some American cardinals. No doubt it was sensible for the good Pope to do it, but it is not a matter that concerns more than a fraction of the people of the United States, nor one, as we see it, that our President was in any way called upon to return our thanks for.

“It is true enough that the appointment of the American cardinals was generally acceptable. There is no objection to American cardinals if they behave as Cardinal Gibbons has behaved this long time. His red hat has never made the least trouble, so far as we ever heard. These new hats that have come may not be so unobtrusive. Our Roman Catholic brethren seemed to be extremely pleased at their coming, and to feel somehow that rank had been conferred on their Church. They seemed to feel that the gentlemen, previously archbishops, who had been promoted, are greater men, and should be generally recognized as greater men, since they received this new mark of papal approbation. The story came from Boston the other day that Cardinal O'Connell, being invited to a public dinner, replied that if he went he must sit on the chairman's right, since his rank as a prince of the Church entitled him to the seat of honor, and he could not consent to yield it to the Governor of Massachusetts.

“That was extraordinary, wasn't it? If the story is true, it is to condole with Cardinal O'Connell for attaining so inconvenient an altitude which will compel him to decline dinners at which the Governor of Massachusetts will be present.

“Except, perhaps, among some of the Catholics, cardinals will not have official rank as princes in this country. We do not know

the rank of 'prince' here. It means nothing except, perhaps, in a visitor. The cardinals are distinguished and representative men, and will be honored as such, and they are doubtless good and useful men, and will be honored for that, but they won't take rank as princes in the United States.

"And as to Governor Foss and Cardinal O'Connell and the seat of honor, displeasing as it must be to any gentleman to claim for himself a seat that some other gentleman prefers, Governor Foss was right, of course, in feeling that in the State of Massachusetts the seat of honor always belongs to the Governor of Massachusetts, except when it is occupied by the President of the United States.

"There is no example the new cardinals can better set than the example of humility and meekness. It is a Christian example, and always needed. Princes or not, they are very eminent men whom all conditions of men will be ready to honor. But they will be apt to be honored inversely to their claims. Precedence will be thrust upon them except where it is demanded; but when it is demanded, it will be found to rest solely on courtesy and good will, and it will be refused when it seems necessary to refuse it."

HIS SUSPENSION OF MR. VALENTINE'S "NUN-GARB ORDER" has brought an avalanche of protests down on President Taft. The protests of the brethren of the Atlantic District, of the South Texas Pastoral Conference, two that were circulated in St. Louis, and several others have been forwarded to us, presumably for publication. But for lack of space we must forbear. Besides, an effort is being made to duplicate one of these protests and supply every member of our organization with a copy, suggesting to him the advisability of signing it and have his fellow-citizens sign it, and forward it to the President.

DR. BENSÖW has published, at Stockholm, a new edition of the Book of Concord in Swedish. He has improved R. R. Broocman's edition of 1730 by giving his rendering in modern Swedish, without, however, sacrificing fidelity to the original text or to the peculiar character of the confessional form. So says Dr. N. Forsander, his reviewer in *Tidskrift*, the theological quarterly of the Augustana Synod. The Augsburg Confession and the Apology have been translated from the Latin, all the rest from the German. Dr. Forsander rightly deplores that, at least, the Augustana was not translated from the German, which was read at Augsburg. The new edition of the Swedish Concordia embodies, of course, the special Swedish confession, the *Uppsala mötes beslut*. The customary historical and textual explanations are given at the end of the book.

A SYMPOSIUM ON "INTERSYNODICAL RELATIONS" appeared in the March issue of *The Theological Magazine* (Columbus, O.). The contributors were Pres. Dahl of the United Norwegian Church, Prof. Voight of the Southern Seminary, Columbia, S. C., Prof. Gerberding of the Chicago Lutheran Seminary, Prof. Jacobs of Mount Airy Seminary, Pres. Richter of the Iowa Synod, Pres. Schmauck of the General Council, Profs. Loy and Stellhorn of Columbus. The symposium discusses three points:

"1. What should be the mutual relations of these synods? 2. What should these synods view as the goal of their mutual relations? 3. What steps should be taken in the present to reach this goal? Editor Gohdes, in commenting upon the symposium, expresses his conviction that the time is ripe for 'the establishment of a joint tribunal to decide charges of usurpation; and secondly, the holding of a free conference.'"

Some of the writers appear greatly exercised over the Missouri Synod. Inasmuch as Missouri is not considered in this federation, the excitement displayed is amusing. We assure all the parties concerned that no Missourian will disturb the contemplated union. There is no reason why it should not be effected. We stand ready to publish the coveted result,—but we fear that the ardent federationists will not produce anything more tangible than words—words—words, and the fine symposium may illustrate the old saying: *Parturiunt montes, nascitur ridiculus mus*. (The mountains were in labor, and brought forth—a mouse.) The chief unifying element seems to be antipathy to Missouri. The gentlemen can indulge in that without a federation.—Prof. Singmaster of Gettysburg comments thus on the symposium:

"We wish these brethren God-speed in their effort to come to a better understanding. We are sorry that the discordant note had to be introduced by Dr. Richter of the Iowa Synod who speaks of the 'unionism of the General Synod' and of 'the fanaticism of Missouri.' Prof. Dr. Loy of the Ohio Synod is also not yet satisfied that the General Synod has learned 'to recognize the Lutheran faith in all its distinctive features as the one pure faith of the Gospel.' Moreover, the General Council, he says, is 'not yet prepared to declare itself in agreement with us [Ohio] on the "four points"'—Chiliasm, mixed communion, exchange of pulpits with sectarians, and secret societies."

WALTER KOENIG clearly and forcibly states the insufficiency of the Sunday-school and impossibility of Christianizing the public schools, so often advocated in our day, in the *Christian Herald*, May 8:—

"One thing is needful—there are many things valuable, but just one needful. A Christian who is such not merely in name has

no doubts about what that one thing is. Christian parents are theoretically unanimous that to neglect the moral and religious training of the child which has come into our home is inconsistent with our avowal that there is just one all-important thing in all the world; indeed, they agree that such neglect is fraught with dire consequences. Yet we need a reminder such as is given by the Rev. Richard Braundstein in the article alluded to, which is really worth reprinting.

"But how is this training to be done? Parents come in first for consideration. Does the little the parents can do meet the demands of the case? Many parents there are who feel their responsibility. They appreciate that to make a living is important, but to make a life is still more important. However, in the stress and swirl of the hurried days and the insistence of vocation, they can hardly find the time and leisure for systematic work on these lines, and many lack the ability. Then there is the Sunday-school. Yes; and it is the only religious instruction some children get. But what idea of the importance of the matter will be raised in the mind of the child who receives systematic instruction in secular studies for five or six hours five days in the week, and hears religious matters discussed just once during this period? The study of the Word of God is crowded into one corner of the week. Thirty hours for secular studies and one hour, or, rather, thirty to forty minutes, if the opening and closing exercises be deducted—one hour, let it be, for the study of religious truths, which are revealed truths, unknown to natural man. The sense of proportion is disturbed by such an arrangement.

"About a year ago, I spent some time at the Child Welfare Exhibit. There I saw—I couldn't help seeing it—a large placard with the superscription: 'A Short-Weight Education.' Then: 'Thirty minutes a week for religious instruction in Protestant churches. Instruction in mathematics offered in elementary and high schools, 1,067 hours, equivalent in time to 41 years of Sunday-school instruction. Instruction in writing, 364 hours, equivalent to 14 years of Sunday-school instruction.' Then followed in large, bold lettering, 'What Is to Be Done?' With regard to Sunday-school, we cannot forget that, even with all the zeal our workers show, they themselves often lack the training that we require of our secular instructors.

"Can we look for help to our public schools? They are maintained by a general tax. All taxpayers, therefore, must have equal rights. What form of religion should there be taught? Immediately the warring factions are upon us. Jews, agnostics, Protestants, and Romanists, all have equal standing before our law, and there surely cannot be religious coercion of a minority. If anything is un-American that certainly is. The equality of all religious beliefs is

also evidenced by the fact that there are teachers in our public schools of all shades of belief and unbelief. There is not, and cannot be, any religious test. But as a father, I want to *know* under whose guidance my boy is during the greater part of his waking hours. Some urge that we should let our public-school teachers preach a creedless religion and morality; but as soon as you make a statement concerning God and righteousness, in fact, any manner of statement, you are voicing a creed. 'I have no creed,' said a woman, and thereby uttered the shortest of all creeds.

"The one deduction that came to me after reading Rev. Mr. Braunstein's forceful article was that under present conditions the only solution is found in the church-school. There seems to be no other way of giving our children, in the way of education, not only a lunch, but a dinner, a full-weight education! In my city, there is such a school with twelve teachers and a building worth \$20,000, maintained by our Holland friends of the Christian Reformed Church, the same denomination which responded so nobly to the plea for the China Famine Fund. The Episcopalians at some places also have such schools. The Lutherans have a still greater number — thousands of them throughout the land. A unique feature of the Lutheran schools is this, that about 80 per cent. of the teachers are men who have made teaching their life-work. The children of these schools have all the secular instruction that is afforded in the public schools, and, in addition, the study of the Word of God; and all instruction throughout the day is permeated by an avowed Christian spirit. I am acquainted with such a Lutheran school in this city, where, because the congregation is not rich in worldly goods, the building is very unpretentious, but where the results of the work of the two male teachers are simply grand, the scholars upon graduation entering the public high school without further examination, and where they easily rank with the best in their classes. The parents who send their children to this school say, 'We know that they can get instruction at other schools; but our children — God bless them! — ought not to be exposed to instruction that is totally divorced from the Word of God. Give them the best possible preparation for their citizenship in this world *and* the next! For a complete education, let there be a union of religious and secular work.'

"What a blessing it would be for the Church and the State, as well as for the individual, if, from the time when our children grapple with the intricacies of the A, B, C to the days when questions of Greek syntax and the fourth dimension loom up, they would be under the guarding and guiding influence of the Word of God and Christian inspiration!"

THE WELL-KNOWN EPISODE during Luther's visit at Rome, while he was mounting Pilate's staircase, has not been considered well authenticated. Preserved Smith, in his recent work on Luther, says: "If one may trust the story which Luther's son Paul remembered hearing his father tell," etc. (p. 19), and in a footnote he adds: "This celebrated story was first published in its original form in 1903. Köstlin-Kawerau I, 749. Paul was only eleven years old when the story was told (in 1544), and he wrote it down thirty-eight years later." Now G. Buchwald has found in an unpublished sermon of Luther, in the Ratschulbibliothek at Zwickau, the following remark: "Romae wolt meum avum ex purgatorio erlosen, ging die Treppen hinauf Pilati, orabam quolibet gradu pater noster. Erat enim persuasio, qui sic oraret, redimeret animam; sed in fastigium veniens cogitabam, quis scit an sit verum," i. e.: "At Rome I wished to redeem my sire from purgatory; I mounted the stairs of Pilate, and recited the Lord's Prayer at each step. For a belief prevailed that a person doing this would redeem his soul; but arriving at the top, I thought: Who knows whether it is so." The record does not say whether the text: "The just shall live by faith" flashed upon Luther while he was going up the stairs.

TAKING UP THE DISCUSSION begun by *The Lutheran* on the subject of popular Lutheran literature, the Augustana Synod's English periodical says:—

"We should not forget that the average church-member is not a college graduate nor a theological student. His mind is not trained along these lines. His interests are practical rather than theoretical. He needs and wants something that he can reach without a step-ladder, something that appeals to his affections and stirs his emotions. His intellect must be reached through his heart. And we need 'middle men,' as *The Lutheran* calls them, 'who will create a literature that lies between our standard books of doctrine, history, and biography, and the worthless writings of superficial men.'

"What difference does it make what Reverend A., or Professor B., or Doctor C., says or thinks? It is not they who need what we aim to bring. They are provided for. It is the *people* of the church. Cherish a brotherly love for this neighbor. Be prompted by the motive of doing him a real service. Say the things he needs to know. And say it in the language of his own daily life and thought. Then we shall have a literature that will really instruct and edify our Church."

A HUGUENOT ANNIVERSARY.—The recent celebration of the two hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the

Huguenot or French Protestant church of Charleston, S. C., was an occasion of unique interest. This church was not only the first church organized in the colony of South Carolina, but is the only Huguenot church remaining on this continent. Those who have seen its unpretentious structure have not failed to feel its historical interest and significance. It is a kind of Westminster Abbey of the Huguenot movement. Rev. Dr. Charles S. Vedder, who for forty-six years has served as its pastor, may be called the foremost citizen of Charleston. He is now in his eighty-sixth year. At the historic commemoration he gave an eloquent account of the founding of the church, sketching its progress and emphasizing the loyalty to faith of the early Huguenots, their power of sacrifice, their spirit of cooperation, and their devotion to the work of their church.—*The Lutheran Companion*.

DOODLEBUG.—This word is not yet in the dictionaries. It is what A. G. Miller of Asheville, N. C., proposes to call any one who is not a socialist and will not believe that the government can guarantee every man happiness and a competence.

AT A METHODIST GATHERING at Toronto, Ont., "almost every speaker upheld Higher Criticism as a valuable asset and a most distinct help to the understanding of God's Word." This drew from Robert Franklin, of Owen Sound, Ont., a protest published in the *Montreal Weekly Witness*, and forwarded to us by one of our students serving as a supply in the vast field of Alberta. From this reply we quote the closing words:—

"Now, what I want to know is this: If the Holy Spirit of God is our divinely appointed Teacher, to teach us all things, and to lead us into all the truth, where does science come in? I cannot find anything about science in the Bible, except where Paul warns the Christians about 'The oppositions of science falsely so called.' And that's the truth in a nutshell. Modern science is opposed to the Word of God. The path for the Christian to-day is very difficult. Men of education to-day are blind to the eternal realities. They say they are seeking for the light. Well, the light is now at the right hand of God in heaven. God fully revealed Himself in that blessed Man whilst He was on earth. The Scriptures abundantly prove it. In John 1, we read, 'He was the true Light, which, coming into the world, lighteth every man.' (R. V.) His own words are, 'As long as I am in the world, I am the Light of the world.' Man made an attempt to extinguish that light by nailing Him to the cross, but it is shining all the brighter, and with far greater glory now; for has He not conquered death and all its powers? Any person that desires

light must look away from this earth to where the man Christ Jesus is. He is the Mediator now; soon He will be the Judge.

"The Christian should ask himself, not if science agrees with a certain passage, but rather, 'Hath God said and shall He not do it? He that believeth not maketh God a liar.' In the epistles we get the characteristics of this age: 'Men heaping to themselves teachers having itching ears, who obey not the truth,' etc. By and by the 'strong delusion' will be sent, and the whole world worshiping Anti-christ. But before that happens, Christ will have come again for His beloved people, according to John 14, 1. 3 and 1 Thess. 4, 13, both dead and living. Beloved child of God, don't be shaken in your faith because some educated men with the title of Rev. Sir disbelieve God's Word; for the apostle speaks of 'Satan himself being transformed into an angel of light, and his ministers as ministers of righteousness.' 'Prove all things; hold fast that which is good!'"

It appears that Mr. Franklin is a layman.

LOVE VS. TRUTH? The book of President Hyde, of Bowdoin College, *From Epicurus to Christ*, has appeared in its sixth edition (since 1904), and under the new title *The Five Great Philosophies of Life* ("the Epicurean Pursuit of Pleasure," the "Stoic Self-Control by Law," the "Platonic Subordination of Lower to Higher," the "Aristotelian Sense of Proportion," the "Christian Spirit of Love"). Hyde's reviewer in the *Princeton Theological Review*, Wm. Brenton Greene, Jr., says: "Our author misconceives the relation of love to truth. Love does not determine truth, but it should itself be according to truth. Orthodoxy may be loveless, (?) but Christian love must be orthodox. As Francis Bowen taught, 'Feeling must justify itself to some idea.' Hence, f. e., creeds are more important than President Hyde would seem to allow. It is in the truth which they define and guard that Christian love is rooted; and were they to pass, or in their essentials be modified, Christian love, while it would for a time continue, would begin to starve and at last would die."

LYMAN ABBOTT'S TRINITY.—In "Letters to Unknown Friends," in *The Outlook*, Lyman Abbott says:—

"No; I do not believe that there are three Gods. There is only one God. And they who imagine, as some seem to do, that the doctrine that there are three persons in one God means, or is thought to mean, that there are three distinct divine individualities or personalities, totally misunderstand the doctrine of the Trinity. I do not propose to try to tell you in this letter what is the doctrine of the Trinity.

I propose only to try to tell you how I think of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

"A friend of mine who knows much more about church theology than I do tells me that I am not an Orthodox Trinitarian, but a Modalistic Monarchian. I am quite indifferent to the labels which are given to me, and I make no attempt to label myself.

"There are three ways, and only three, in which any person can manifest himself to other persons: by his works, by the story of his life, and by his personal companionship. I ask a musical acquaintance of mine, 'Do you know Elgar?' 'Oh, yes,' he says; 'very well. I rank him as the first of living English composers.' 'Tell me about him,' I say. 'Is he a Protestant or a Roman Catholic?' 'Oh, I know nothing about that,' he answers; 'I know him only as a musician.' 'Have you ever seen him?' 'Never.' He knows Sir Edward Elgar by his musical compositions.

"Stirred by my inquiry, he goes to a musical library, takes down from the shelves a cyclopaedia or a book of biography, and learns about the life of Sir Edward Elgar—that he is a Roman Catholic; that he began his career as an organist in a Roman Catholic church; that he later became conductor of an instrumental society; that his later work has been that of a composer. Now he has a new acquaintance with Elgar, an acquaintance which throws light also on Elgar's music.

"Later he goes abroad. He gets a letter of introduction, presents it, is received at Elgar's house as his guest. The two are congenial, and he becomes Elgar's intimate friend. Now he has obtained a third and still better acquaintance.

"But neither of these methods of acquaintance alone is sufficient. If the maid in Elgar's house knows nothing and cares nothing for music, she does not know Elgar. If the writer of Elgar's biography has never seen him, he does not know Elgar. If the performer of his works has neither read the story of his life nor made his acquaintance, he does not know Elgar. To a real acquaintance with Elgar a knowledge of his music, acquaintance with his life, and personal companionship are essential."

This illustration Abbot uses in explaining the revelation of God by means of His works, the incarnation of His Word, and the companionship of His Spirit with man's spirit. The entire illustration breaks down before those texts of Scripture in which one person of the Godhead is introduced as speaking to, or about, another. Comp. John 5, 20; 15, 26; 17, 5. According to Abbot, the incarnate God

would there be speaking to the creating God concerning the witnessing God. In other words, A is speaking to A about A, or God engages in a soliloquy concerning Himself.

"NE TEMERE" APPLIED IN AMERICA.—*The Protestant Magazine* (vol. IV, No. 2), of Washington, D. C., publishes a facsimile of a baptismal certificate, the attending circumstances of which are related as follows:—

"A Roman Catholic Hungarian, of Perth Amboy, N. J., named Stephen Dagonya, was married on August 4, 1909, to Mary Csoma, a member of the Hungarian Reformed Church of the same city, by the pastor of her church, Rev. Louis Nanassy. In November, 1910, they took their little girl, Anna Susanna, to the Roman Catholic priest, Rev. Francis Gross, for baptism. When the father asked for the certificate of baptism, the priest declared their marriage was not a marriage, and that they were living in concubinage, but that it would become a marriage if the parents would pay him a fee of fifteen dollars and be remarried by him. The father replied that his marriage was valid and lawful according to the law of the State and his conscience, and he refused to remarry. The priest then wrote out a certificate of baptism in which he stated that the child was illegitimate, and that the parents were living in concubinage. A reproduction of the original certificate and the translation of the same appear as a double frontispiece in this issue of the *Protestant Magazine*. The translation of the vital part of the certificate follows:—

"On the sixth day of the month of November, in the year of our Lord 1910, in the church of the Holy Cross of Perth Amboy, Middlesex County, New Jersey, Diocese of Trenton, according to the rite of the Roman Catholic Church, I baptized Anna Susanna (illegitimate), born on the fifth day of the month of November, A. D. 1910, in Perth Amboy, New Jersey, of the father, Stephen Dagonya, Roman Catholic, whose place of birth was Kis-Varda (comitat Szabolcs), and whose place of living is ———; and of the mother, Mary Csoma, Reformed, whose place of birth was Patroha (comitat Szabolcs) and whose place of living is ———. The sponsors were Emericus Szlatenji, Anna Kecses. Remarks: The parents are living in concubinage."

The same periodical cites the following comment on the *Ne Temere* decree from the *Continent* (Chicago):—

"Protestant antipathy to the decree has been wrought up by something very different—by the meddlesomeness of priests who use the church's law to break up homes in which Catholic wife or husband

has been married to Protestant husband or wife by Protestant minister or civil magistrate. Where care for morals exceeds zeal for formalities, such unions would be recognized as honest marriages making honorable homes. The sincerity of the contracting parties is the paramount consideration. Attempts to charge immorality upon such wedlock merely because it does not conform to technical church rules are socially disintegrating, and therefore intolerable from the viewpoint of the impartial citizen. The question becomes at this point not a religious, but a civic matter; and the state has the right, as is now proposed in Canada, to make it a criminal offense for any one to advise a husband or wife to desert a marriage duly legalized by the state."

It is time that an agitation be begun throughout the length and breadth of our commonwealth against this insulting piece of dago diplomacy from the Vatican. Any priest who dares to carry out the *Ne Temere* decree should be prosecuted for slander and sedition. The *Ne Temere* decree is revolutionary.

REVIEWING THE CATHOLIC CONTRIBUTIONS to the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia*, Willis J. Beecher says: "Whatever we may think of all the sweetness and light which Dr. McCarthy attributes to the Spaniards and the ante-Protestant English and others, in the part they took in early American history and in the founding of American institutions, this at least is true: that it is laudable for our Roman Catholic friends to busy themselves in looking up their history; that it is natural for them to interpret that history favorably, and from their own point of view as American citizens, and to go as far as possible in taking pride in it. They are doing this, and doing it effectively, and they deserve to be commended for it. They have schools through which to propagate their view, and bright, attractive authors who are infusing it into current literature. They are covering the country with monuments to early Roman Catholic missionaries and explorers. Meanwhile we Protestants are indifferent to our early American forefathers. We have no schools in which we can give instruction concerning them without first eliminating the distinctively religious factors that made them what they were. We leave them to be written up mainly by men and women who are agnostic in regard to the truths which were most potent in the minds of the Puritans and the Pilgrims and the Friends and the others who came early to our shores. We have ourselves to thank for it if the common opinion of the next American generation shall be that most of the early heroisms of the country were the deeds

of Roman Catholics, and that our distinctively American ideas and institutions are really, in the main, mostly of Roman Catholic origin. Our friends do not need to make any misstatements in order to make this impression. All that they need to do is to set forth in the light what is fine in their history, while we continue to treat ours with neglect, leaving it to the tender mercies of persons who are out of sympathy with it."

Catholic zeal along the lines indicated above deserves no praise, for it is not loyal to the truth. Protestant indifference may deserve to be scored, but even here allowance must be made. The facts of history are on the side of Protestants, not of Catholics. Protestants can afford to look on with calm composure, even with amusement, at the frenzied efforts of American Jesuits who are "writing up" their church: they cannot "write down" those stubborn things—facts. We admit, however, that this forbearance, begotten of self-conscious strength, has a limit. The Jesuits are poisoning the wells of public information in America. If they are allowed to continue, it will be impossible in fifty years to obtain true accounts of historical events from cyclopedias and text-books of history. Much perverted history has been printed in America, much good history has been suppressed during the last twenty-five years. The nation is being systematically duped by Catholic orators and writers when they cite history. The blindness of Protestants who do not see, the cowardice of Protestants who fail to resent, this assault upon truth, is even more deplorable than the indifference of Protestants who care not what becomes of them or their children when Rome will have won its wily game; for these latter would lose nothing, and might, for all practical purposes, belong bodily to the Roman Church now, without causing a great loss to Protestants or bringing great gain to Romanists.

"THERE IS ONE WAY TO PURIFY THE SCHOOLROOM, and that is to put Christ there; there is one way to keep pure the child mind, and that is to put him under the care of Mary, the Blessed Mother, with the Christ-child as his companion and friend. There is one education to-day which is complete, and the only one, and that is religious education, and it is that education that to-day we include in the group of Catholic charities."

The speaker was the Roman Archbishop of St. Louis, at the Conference of Catholic Charities on May 5. Christ—Mary—Rome! the ideal guardian triad of the child's school, yea, the only effectual one! This combination is as irreverent as it is bigoted. Christ only, and Christ all and in all,—this is the Scriptural rule. But a

collocation of incongruous elements, such as in the Archbishop's assertion, exhibits the cunning of Jesuitism. Christ is put in the foreground with great *éclat* and a fine show of truth; and then the lie is attached to it, and the old dragon's tail comes trailing after. *Mundus vult decipi; ergo*. The superficial listener is impressed with the first statement and fails to note that the second and third statements neutralize and annihilate the first. All the canons of the Council of Trent, now the supreme law of faith for Catholics, are constructed after this Christ-Belial fashion.

AT RABBI JOSEPH KRAUSKOPF'S BROAD STREET TABERNACLE (Philadelphia) a class for the study of the life and times of Jesus of Nazareth had been organized. Philip Sidersky, Superintendent Emmanuel Mission to the Jews of Baltimore, was attracted by a notice of the Rabbi's class, and, while on an official visit at Philadelphia, attended one of the meetings. The Rabbi had on his desk Thomas Jefferson's New Testament, a book by Arthur Drews, who was lately repudiated at a mass-meeting at Berlin, another book by Prof. Foster of Chicago University, who was expelled from the Baptist Church for heresy, and a book of Nathaniel Smith of Cornell, the critic of the New Testament. For an hour and a half the Rabbi regaled the Jews present with excerpts from these books. Then he invited any one present to put questions if they desired. None of the Jews putting a question, Mr. Sidersky asked the Rabbi what his personal belief regarding Jesus was. The Rabbi gave a very copious answer, the gist of which was that Jesus might have existed and gathered around Himself a number of uneducated people, like Coxie's army. Another question, whether the Rabbi's authorities were not contradictory, since Prof. Drews held that Jesus had not existed at all, while Prof. Foster held that a man by that name had lived, the Rabbi parried by saying it was getting late.—In introducing his books of reference, Rabbi Krauskopf made it a point to state what each had cost him. For Prof. Drews' he said he had paid \$3.50, which made a perceptible impression on the audience.

PASTOR JATHO, of Cologne, Germany, was declared heretical some time ago by his ecclesiastical authorities. He had been a friend of Harnack, and claimed that he had published Harnack's views. Harnack discredited the report, and in reviewing the sentence passed on Jatho's case, he now equivocates. This leads the humorous *Klad-deradatsch* to say: "Prof. Harnack has expressed his opinion of the finding of the committee that sat on the case of Jatho. He has expressed himself in such a comprehensive way as to represent Jatho's

friends afore and Jatho's enemies aft. He has expressed himself *protra* Jatho, namely, *pro* Jatho afore and *contra* Jatho aft. He has pramed the committee, namely, praised it afore and blamed it aft. He intends to inaugurate a torch-concert for the committee, namely, a torch-light procession afore and a cats' concert aft. In offering a toast for the committee, he will call for a *viveat*, namely, for a *vivat* afore and for a *pereat* aft. For he is an adhponent of Jatho, namely, an adherent afore and an opponent aft. He is a Jatho-crier afore and a Jatho-decrier aft." To appreciate the humor, the above must be read in the original:

"Er hat sich *protra* Jatho ausgesprochen, naemlich vorne *pro* und hinten *contra* Jatho. Er hat das Spruchkollegium gelodelt, naemlich vorne gelobt und hinten getadelt. Er will ihm eine Fackelmusik bringen, naemlich vorne einen Fackelzug und hinten eine Katzenmusik. Dabei will er dem Spruchkollegium ein *viveat* ausbringen, naemlich vorne ein *vivat* und hinten ein *pereat*. Denn er ist ein Anhegner von Jatho, naemlich vorne ein Anhaenger und hinten ein Gegner. Vorne ist er ein Jathorufer und hinten ein Neinsager. Darum ist er, was er sagt: Ja-nein."

These remarks are accompanied by a cartoon representing Harnack as a rope-walker. His balancing-pole is inscribed at the left end, "Liberal Theology," at the right end, "Orthodoxy." Bassermann, the Liberal member of the Reichstag, is represented as an interested spectator, and as saying, "As a rope-walker Harnack, after all, surpasses me."

LESSING'S FAMOUS "BREITER GRABEN" is thus reproduced by Wm. Brenton Greene, Jr.: "A supernatural and, therefore, historical and special revelation could not be accepted if it conflicted with the intentions and conclusions of our own reason; and yet if it merely agreed with them, it would be superfluous." This is the fatal dilemma which Lessing constructed against Christianity and the Bible. This old argument is reproduced in Robert Eucken's *The Truth of Religion*, the book that was awarded the Nobel prize in 1908. Dr. Greene considers Lessing's and Eucken's "broad ditch" an absurdity, and says: "To see it, we must stultify ourselves." He constructs this counter-dilemma: If there were not a sphere of truth that goes far beyond our reason, "man's mind would be 'the measure of all things.' In a word, the supernatural would be compassed by that which by its very nature necessarily presupposes the supernatural." This might also be expressed thus: If the Bible were not given by God, it could not be given by men. For men could not give what they do not possess.

THE WAR OF ITALY AGAINST TURKEY was sanctioned by the Pope. Norman Angell, writing in *International Conciliation*, says:—

"We know what preceded this war: if Europe had any moral conscience left, it would have been shocked as it was never shocked before. Turkey said: 'We will submit Italy's grievance to any tribunal that Europe cares to name, and abide by the result.' Italy said: 'We don't intend to have the case judged, but to take Tripoli. Hand it over—in twenty-four hours.' The Turkish government said: 'At least make it possible for us to face our own people. Call it a Protectorate; give us the shadow of sovereignty. Otherwise it is not robbery,—to which we could submit,—but gratuitous degradation; we should abdicate before the eyes of our own people. We will do anything you like.' 'In that case,' said Italy, 'we will rob; and we will go to war.' It was not merely robbery that the Italian government intended, but they meant from the first that it should be war—to 'dish the Socialists,' to play some sordid intrigue of internal politics. The ultimatum was launched from the center of Christendom, the city which lodges the titular head of the Universal Church, to teach to the Mahomedan world what may be expected from a modern Christian government with its back to eighteen centuries of Christian teaching."

The last clause implicates the Pope, else it is meaningless. The censure is doubly just: 1) because the Pope has no business, if he is no more than a minister of Christ, to help start a war; 2) least of all, such a war.

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA has rejected the Bill of the Hon. Mr. Basu, which legalized marriage between persons of different castes and religions. The *Harvest Field*, of Mysore City, deplores this action, and illustrates its reason by the following instance:—

"*The Indian Social Reformer* gives an example of how the law works at present. Some fifty years ago, a Sudra married a Brahman widow of sixteen, and she bore him eight children. In 1901, he repudiated the woman, who sued him for maintenance since he cast her off. The lower court maintained that according to Hindu law the marriage was illegal, and dismissed the suit. The High Court of Bombay has pronounced the marriage, if any, to have been sinful, and dismissed the appeal that had been made to it. Under existing circumstances it is impossible for persons of different castes or religions to become legally married unless one or both of them renounce

the religion to which they may belong. The injury generally falls upon the woman, who has no redress."

THE RELIGIOUS CENSUS OF INDIA, 1911, shows that since 1901 Christians have increased from 2,923,241 to 3,876,203; Hindus, 207,147,026 — 217,586,920; Sikhs, 2,195,339 — 3,014,466; Jains, 1,334,148 — 1,248,162; Buddhists, 9,476,759 — 10,721,453; Zoroastrians (Parsis), 94,190 — 100,096; Mussulmans, 62,458,077 — 66,623,412; Jews, 18,228 — 20,980; Animists, 8,584,148 — 10,295,168; minor religions, and religions not returned, 129,900 — 37,101. The total population increased 294,361,056 — 313,523,981, or 6.5 per cent. The Christians have reported the second highest increase per cent., as the following table shows:—

Jain	decrease of 6 per cent.
Hindu	increase of 5 "
Muhammedan	" 6.6 "
Buddhist	" 13 "
Animist	" 20 "
Christian	" 32.6 "
Sikh	" 37 "

THE OTHER REVOLUTION which has taken place in China may be inferred from these words: "The reputation of Christian missions is growing every day, and the prejudice and the misunderstanding which formerly existed between the Christian and the non-Christian have gradually disappeared, which will surely prove to be for the good of China." The speaker was V. K. Wellington Koo, a Columbia student, who has sailed for his native land to become "English-speaking" Secretary to Yuan-Shih-Kai. He was interviewed by clergymen in the interest of the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational China missions.

PROF. DAVID S. CAIRNS, writing in the *International Review of Missions* and reviewing the political tension between Germany and Great Britain, points out what a European war would mean for missions. "There is no aggressive project of our missionary societies that would not feel the effect." "Everywhere throughout Asia and Africa men would be compelled to wait idly and see the great flood-tide that might have carried them into the harbor sweep past them and turn again to the fatal ebb."

BOOK REVIEW.

Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., has issued:—

1. **SERMONS ON THE EPISTLES OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL YEAR.** By *Henry Sieck*. IX and 385 pages, 6×9. Bound in green buckram; gold stamping on back and sides. Price, \$1.50, postpaid.

Epistle postils are few in *any* language; even in the *German* language there are not too many. We know of many brethren who have been longing for a new series of sermons on the Epistles. And we all know that of sound Lutheran literature of *any* description in the *English* language there is a scarcity. So also of English sermonic literature which can conscientiously be recommended as a model to the young pastor and the pastor to whom English preaching is a new and unaccustomed thing. Using foreign helps is always fraught with danger, because *semper aliquid haeret*. And even if the pastor is on his guard against imbibing any of the false doctrine of his model, yet there is that danger of spoiling one's taste unawares, of losing the old Lutheran soberness in the presentation of the simple Bible truths. — Here are 65 sermons of moderate length on the Epistle lessons for all Sundays and festival days of the church-year. The author and his mode of preaching are not unknown amongst us, he having published several volumes of sermons and having contributed sermons for our *Magazine* for years. He preaches the way of salvation through repentance and faith in Christ and His Gospel. As sermons on *Epistles*, which were addressed to Christian congregations, these sermons mostly deal with such subjects as: the glory and blessedness of the children of God; additional instruction in the truths of the Christian doctrine; warning against sin and against falling from grace; the dangers and trials besetting a Christian; of tribulation and consolation, etc. But all instruction, warning, exhortation, and consolation is born of, and borne by, the central truth of the Christian religion, *viz.*, salvation by faith in Christ Jesus. — The language used is clear and simple, as it always should be in public discourses before mixed audiences and, above all, in our English sermons for our people, who, in regard to language, are more or less in the period of transition.

E. P.

2. **THE PASTOR IN THE SICK-ROOM.** A Handbook of Lessons and Prayers for the Visitation of the Sick. Compiled by *C. A.* IV and 58 pages; semi-flexible and gilt edge. 85 cts.

Dr. Paley is least known by his *Clergyman's Companion in Visiting the Sick*. Yet this treatise of one of England's foremost apologists ran through nine editions, and when Rev. Wayland, in 1887, undertook the publication of a new edition of Paley's works, the demand for the *Clergyman's Companion*, which "had become exceedingly scarce," was so great that it was published in one of the first volumes of the new five-volume edition. — Any writer who undertakes a work of this kind is certain of the interested attention of the

clergy; and any writer who succeeds in offering the proper material for pastoral ministrations to the sick may rely on having secured the gratitude of the best Christian pastors. For there is no doubt that pastors, as a rule, face their most arduous tasks at a sick-bed; and a friendly mentor on such an occasion, being a friend in need, proves a friend indeed. The booklet before us meets most of the needs arising in pastoral visits to the sick. It is sound in doctrine, reverent in its diction, and equally free from that sickly sentimentalism and cold perfunctoriness which not infrequently disgrace the pastor's call on his sick parishioner.—We expect this helpful compilation of Bible-texts and prayers to run through many editions. God speed it on its mission of earnest entreaty and blessed comfort!

3. *W. WEGENER, PRAKTISCHE BEHANDLUNG DER BIBLISCHEN GESCHICHTE.* Altes Testament. VI and 211 pages; 80 cts.

This is the worthy companion volume of the one for the New Testament which we noted vol. XIV, p. 249.

4. *H. B. FEHNER, SUMMARY OF UNITED STATES HISTORY AND CIVIL GOVERNMENT.* 99 pages; 30 cts.

In 766 brief statements, often not more than a line in length, the gist of what a parochial-school teacher should teach the child in United States History is here given.—The Second Part presents in similar fashion, first, the leading facts of our civil government, next, questions for review of this topic.

5. *STATISTISCHES JAHRBUCH* der Deutschen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Synode von Missouri, Ohio und andern Staaten für das Jahr 1911. 222 pages; 50 cts.

The complete statistics by parishes and districts, with reports from the various boards, of the Missouri Synod are here given.

6. *DIE JUGENDSACHE.* Contains suggestions helpful to the pastor in his ministrations to the young. It is issued by a committee appointed for this purpose by our Western District.
7. *WHY LUTHERAN CHURCH SCHOOLS?* A popular answer to this question.

8. *NINETEEN TRACTS OF REV. DALLMANN,* often noted in these pages, have become the property of the above firm, and are offered for sale at low prices for single orders or orders in lots.

9. *DIE UNCHRISTLICHE "CHRISTLICHE WISSENSCHAFT."* This is a German rendering by Rev. Czamanske of Rev. Dallmann's tract. 5 cts.; dozen, 40 cts.; 100 copies, \$2.50 and postage.

10. *DR. WALTHER CENTENNIAL SERMON.* Delivered at the Ev. Luth. St. Paul's Church, New Orleans, La., October 29, 1911, by Rev. N. J. Bakke. 6 cts., postpaid.

This able address, based on Hebr. 13, 7, sets forth that the celebration of the Walther Centennial will redound to the glory of

God and be a lasting benefit to ourselves, when we 1. gratefully remember the Word of God he taught us; 2. zealously strive to follow his faith and copy his example.

The Twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of our Orphan Home at College Point, N. Y., has caused a neat booklet to be published describing the past and present status of this charitable institution. Rev. Wm. Koepchen of New York City can supply the booklet.

Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, Wis., announces Nos. 11 and 12 of *HOENECKE'S DOGMATIK*, pp. 321—461.

Rev. D. Simon of Baltimore, Md., has published *A PASTOR'S APPEAL*, urging members of the church to attend the Lord's Supper.

WHAT LUTHERANS BELIEVE. One Hundred Questions Answered. By *George Philip Kabele, B.D.*

This tract presents the fundamentals of Lutheran teaching in the form of questions, to which the answer is often given in the form of a Bible text.

Den Norske Synodes Forlag, Decorah, Iowa, announces the following publications:

1. *DE FIRE EVANGELIER*; synoptisk fremstilling med forklaringer. Af *Joh. Ylvisaker*, professor theologiae. 1905. 2 vols. in one. 388 and 369 pages; \$4.00.

This Norwegian Harmony of the Gospels is the fruit of many years of study, while the author was successively pastor, professor of theology, visitor in Dr. Luthardt's lectures at the University of Leipzig, and again professor of theology in the Norwegian Synod, by order of whose *Kirkeraad* the book is now published. It is a labor of love ("mit kjaerste studium") which the author here lays before the Norwegian Lutheran Church. While acknowledging helpful suggestion and directions received during his visit at Leipzig, where he attended Luthardt's lectures on the Gospels on Lichtenstein's foundation, the author has felt it his duty to dissent from the doctrine he heard propounded at that time. Faithful use of the great Lutheran Harmony of Chemnitz-Leyser-Gerhard, of Bengel, Calov's *Biblia Illustrata*, Caspari, Geikie, Edersheim, Stoeckhardt, Zahn, Strack-Zoeckler, etc., characterizes this book. After a general introduction (pp. 1—33), the author takes up the events in our Lord's life in chronological order, and expounds section after section of the Gospels. The Norwegian text of each section is placed at the head of the commentary. As to the sequence of events in the life of Christ one would occasionally dissent from the order adopted by the author; but his exposition breathes the spirit of Lutheranism. It is beyond question the *opus palmare*, so far, that has come from the orthodox Norwegian Lutheran press of America.

2. *BOOK OF FAMILY PRAYER*. Bible Lessons with Meditations for each Day. Arranged after the Church-Year. By *N. J. Laache*. Translated from the Norwegian by *Peer O. Strömme*. 1902. 628 pages; \$1.65.

The "English Laache" has for a decade been a household book not only in Norwegian, but also in other Lutheran families who favor the use of English at family devotion. It deserves all the praise which has hitherto been bestowed on it. In the place of further comment we offer this sample meditation for the day when this notice was penned:—

239. THURSDAY AFTER WHITSUNDAY.

Again we pray, Lord Jesus, pour out Thy Spirit upon us! Amen.

Acts 2, 29—36. Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulcher is with us unto this day. Therefore, being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, He would raise up Christ to sit on his throne, he, seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that His soul was not left in hell, neither His flesh did see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, He hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear. For David is not ascended into the heavens; but he saith himself, The Lord saith unto my Lord, Sit Thou on my right hand until I make Thy foes Thy footstool. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ. —

That which the Son of God has done for us the Holy Ghost explains, and establishes it firmly in the hearts of the faithful. That Christ became a man, and suffered death, and rose again, and entered into His glory; that He made atonement for our sins, delivered us from the curse of the Law, and gained for us eternal life; that He reconciled us to God, appeased His anger, and annihilated death;—all this is indisputable; "it is finished." It was foretold by David and all the prophets, because it had been determined in the counsel of God; and now it is presented in the Gospel as an incontrovertible, accomplished fact. Now the prophecies are easy to understand; for they have been unwrapped out of their swaddling clothes. Now they are easy to believe; for their truth has been established by their fulfillment. Christ died, but is risen and lives; the Holy Ghost came, and the Church was founded; and in it we have the means of grace, the Word and sacraments, which Jesus has given us, with life and salvation for all them that believe.

We know this to be truth; for we have the testimony of the Holy Ghost in our hearts. He confirms the Word in our experience; and He leads us into the fellowship of the Son of God, thus giving us knowledge of sin and grace, of death and life. But you are not saved by knowing these things and regarding them as true, if the Spirit do not establish their truth in your heart. Ask it of Him in earnest prayer; He will not cast off one who says: "Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief!" Do not let Him go until you have the full assurance of the truth in your heart. This is not a matter to be regarded lightly; it is a question of eternal life or eternal death. We are dealing with the question of salvation from cruel death and the pit of hell, from the grievous corruption of your soul, and from the righteous wrath of God. Something more is needed than mere human learning and idle speculations. None save the Spirit of God can bring the truth and life into the heart, and there com-

firm the testimony of the Scripture, so that we believe with that faith which is stronger than death and hell, because it is divine in its nature, and is founded on the truth of God. Dear friend, life is here, and light, and salvation; they are to be found in the Word, in which is also the Spirit, who will bring them home to your soul. By His grace you may receive them, and arrive at certainty in regard to your salvation. If you do not as yet have this faith, then may God make you zealous to pursue it with all your heart! — Grant us this grace, merciful Lord Jesus! Proclaim the truth in such a way that we accept it, and that we reach the full assurance of faith, the certainty that Thou art God, and that we have life in Thee. Let us experience in our souls the power of Thy resurrection, that we may live in Thee, and confess Thy name alway. Amen.

Holy Spirit, all-divine, Dwell within this heart of mine; Cast down every idol-throne, Reign supreme, and reign alone.

See, to Thee I yield my heart; Shed Thy life through every part. A pure temple I would be, Wholly dedicate to Thee.

At the end of the book there are offered "some short morning and evening prayers, for the use of such as do not use their own words when having family prayer."

3. *OUR HOMES AND OUR CHILDREN*. Lectures by *O. Klykken*. Translated from the Norwegian by *Peer Strømme*. 1909. 232 pages; 75 cts.

The domestic relations, in seasons of joy and sorrow, with the dangers besetting them and the Christian training of children, are the subjects of these lectures which were first delivered before the teachers and students of the school "Fredley" in Strinden, Norway. The geniality of sympathetic interest and a fervent zeal for the promotion of youthful piety are evident everywhere in these lectures.

Augustana Book Concern, Rock Island, Ill., announces the following publications:

1. *THE LUTHERAN SUNDAY-SCHOOL HANDBOOK*, by *Rev. J. R. E. Hunt*, B.D. With a Foreword by *Dr. Norelius*, and an introduction by *Dr. Gerberding* of the Chicago Seminary. 291 pages; \$1.00.

It is, in itself, a sign of growing intelligence and conscientiousness that efforts are multiplying in Lutheran circles to make the Sunday-school an efficient instrument of Lutheran educational and missionary endeavor. "Helps," special courses of lectures, regular weekly meetings, arranged for the benefit of Sunday-school teachers, — all this shows that Lutherans intend to apply to the Sunday-school the old rule that what is worth doing at all is worth doing well. We are still in the pioneer stage of these endeavors, and any effort along these lines deserves to be treated with a double portion of the critic's leniency, and credit ought to be given because the effort was made at all. On the other hand, it is because we are in a formative period with most of our Sunday-school enterprises that every attempt at systematizing this work of our church will be examined with critical eyes. — *Rev. Hunt's book divides into three parts: 1. Fundamental principles of the Lutheran Sunday-school (15 chapters and 155 pages); 2. The Lutheran Sunday-school teacher (7 chapters and 70 pages); 3. The Lutheran Sunday-school pupil (4 chapters and 39 pages). —*

The introductory chapter we consider irrelevant and misleading, though a similar effort, in part, was made years ago by Dr. Trumbull in his lectures at Yale. With a dash and *esprit* that is exhilarating, the author declares the synagogue schools of the Jews (p. 14), the catechetical school at Alexandria in the days of Origen (p. 15), John Gerson's school at Paris, and the instruction of the young by the Wycliffites, Hussites, and Waldensians (p. 16), the catechetical instruction adopted in Luther's days (p. 17), Spener's "Kinderlehre," and Robert Raikes's Sabbath-school at Gloucestershire (p. 19) — the generic antecedents of the modern Sunday-school. A noble pedigree, forsooth — and ahem! What, if all this is — not so? If a pedigree for this foreign thing in the Lutheran Church, the Sunday-school, is to be established by this method, we are ready to admit to the ancestry of the modern Sunday-school also the home-training which Cain and Abel received. That would carry us back to the remotest confines of history, and surely satisfy the most fanatic ancestor-worshiper. These genealogical schemes are always interesting, often amusing, and hardly ever convincing. They prove that the religious training of the young has in all ages received the earnest attention of the Church in some form, — no more. Other ages have had their ways and methods, we have ours. There is no necessity for finding ancient parallels for a modern institution. Within the Lutheran Church the Sunday-school is something novel. It is an exotic plant, and no amount of historical argument can prove it indigenous to Lutheran soil. We have adopted it, partly because we need it, partly because we think we need it. We shall test the new institution, and if it fails to do the work designed for it, we shall discard it with as little compunction as we experienced in adopting it. It is with us merely a practical issue of our modern complicated church life. — Or are we to be led to regard the modern Sunday-school as the crowning triumph, and the climax, of all previous efforts to afford religious instruction to the young? Speaking of the old "Kinderlehre," our author says: "The Missouri, Iowa, and kindred [*sic!*] synods use it extensively as a means of indoctrinating their people. This custom was a tremendous power in the religious education of the youth of the Lutheran Church. To a great extent it took the place of the Sunday-school and did the work which the school now endeavors to do. It was a good thing and served its day well." (p. 25.) Of the parochial school he says: "A new impetus was given to the parochial school by the Missouri Synod. Believing that religious instruction should go hand in hand with secular instruction, this synod vigorously championed the cause of the parochial school. If at all possible, a school was organized in every congregation. If the congregation was not able to secure the service of a teacher, the pastor himself acted as teacher of the school. This system of parochial schools had a very wide influence on the religious instruction of the youth in this country. But it is passing away. The time is fast coming when the congregations can no longer maintain these schools." (p. 26.) And as to the Sunday-school the author says: "The time was when the Lutheran Church recognized it as a 'Ragged School,' and considered it a good thing for the poor children; but that notion has passed away and has given place to nobler

conceptions of its scope and aim. It is emphatically the Church's recognized method of fulfilling her mission to the young. It is not implied that there never was, nor ever can be, a fulfillment of that mission in other forms. The parochial school is a good system, perhaps better than the Sunday-school in many respects, but the parochial school is passing, and the Sunday-school is here to stay." (p. 31.) The author caps the climax by saying: "The Sunday-school cannot be superseded by any day-school in existence." (p. 32.) We admire the courage of the author's conviction, but we question the wisdom of his utterance. Other men who have had an opportunity to test the efficiency and adequacy of the Sunday-school through a longer period of time and with great thoroughness, have told the Church different things about the Sunday-school, *e. g.*, Editor Bok. We can only say that we hope for the best, but we grant at the start that we may feel grievously disappointed in the end. While we must have it, we propose to make the best of it, and ask the Lord to bless our efforts.

2. DAILY MEDITATIONS UPON THE EPISTLE LESSONS OF THE CHURCH-YEAR. By *Rev. F. Hammarsten*. Translated from the Swedish. 642 pages; \$1.50.

These meditations, prepared by a Swedish court-chaplain, are brief and practical pastoral talks. They are based on a text, usually chosen from the Epistle Lessons (though not all these lessons are treated, *e. g.*, the Lenten Lessons). The text is expounded in the easiest manner imaginable, without the least effort at exegetical *finesse*, and so far as we have examined the book (nearly half), the exposition is correct, except that the author believes in a general conversion of the Jews before the end of the world. Every text with its exposition is made to bear on the everyday duties of Christian life, conveying cheer or warning, as the case may be. The meditations are arranged according to the civil year; a scheme at the end shows how they can be adapted to the sequence of the church-year.

The Lutheran Book Concern of Columbus, O., announces the following publications:—

1. SERMONS ON THE EPISTLES for the Sundays and Chief Festivals of the Church-Year. By *M. Loy*, D.D. 810 pages.

The sixty-two sermons based on the Epistle-lessons of the Lutheran pericopal system which this book contains are clear and convincing restatements of truths of Holy Writ, and not their least merit is their plain style and the lucid arrangement of the materials of the text. The author's English is worth a study. It is equally far removed, on the one hand, from the efflorescent ornateness and the sesquipedalian verbosity of the cathedral orator, and the prudery and affectation of the pulpit essayist, and, on the other hand, from the carelessness and *nonchalance* of the modern press.—The arrangement of text-materials follows the time-honored custom of our Church: there is a theme, which condenses the lesson of the text into one striking statement; the theme is subdivided into parts, and in each part the author even indicates his subdivisions. The author's evident aim is to unfold his text. It is clearly Scriptural preaching, Bible

preaching, that is offered in this book. And the particular truth to be set forth in this or that sermon is led forth from the text without labor. Moreover, the book is singularly free from the peculiar teachings fostered by the church-body of which the author is a revered member. The *intuitu fidei*, no doubt, is intended on p. 77, but it is expressed in this perfectly proper form: "Let us not forget that the promise of the eternal inheritance was from the start a promise of grace, embracing the coming of a Savior and His reception by faith." We are also aware that there are some in the Synod to which the author belongs who will cross themselves with holy horror, and will think of "those Calvinistic Missourians," when they read the following: "Some who call themselves Christians are blind enough to charge the sin upon God, by teaching that He has from eternity decreed that only a select few shall by His arbitrary choice be saved, while all the rest shall be justly damned; that only for this (!) chosen few did our Savior die, and only for this select company is there any grace unto salvation in the Word and Sacrament; and that, in short, God wills only these to be saved, and accordingly saves them by an irresistible grace, while for all the rest there is no mercy and no help, and all the seeming calls of mercy and offers of help are divine deception and pretense. The very mention of such horrible heresies has a suggestion of blasphemy and produces a shudder. O brethren, beware of false prophets and seducing spirits," etc. (p. 247.) We have often wondered what the feelings of an Ohio Lutheran must be who should happen to hear the above errors denounced by a Missouri Lutheran, who, he was taught, defends those errors. — The author insists, p. 401, on the difference between stones, plants, animals, and angels and men, because only the latter can "choose between right and wrong," and having been "made with intelligence and wills," God "does not force them to conform to His holiness and righteousness." In the paragraph in which these words occur the author is speaking of the Law. He sums up his statement thus: "God does not compel us to obey His holy Law, but does compel us to submit to the punishment which His Word denounces upon those who violate His Law." Further on he exhibits the regenerating power of the Gospel, *which quickens the dead into life*, etc. And on p. 564 we find the following: "People are nursing a dangerous delusion when they flatter themselves that in virtue of their rational nature they are entitled to all the privileges and blessings of God's children by right of creation." Now, then, what does this distinction between man and brute amount to, practically? Only this, that God has His peculiar *modus agendi* in regard to either. That is all. Besides, the Lutheran Confessions know of another difference between man and a block or stone! It is not this, that man can choose between right and wrong, but this, that he can resist, and, as much as in him lies, only does resist, divine grace. The removal of this resistance is his spiritual resurrection, or regeneration. In view of this, we believe that, when speaking of the sinner's acceptance of salvation which is offered him as a free gift, the author's language, to say the least, requires pruning, *viz.*: "This we are to accept, which we do when we believe. It is true that we are doing something when we accept it. 'Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be

saved,' is a command as well as a promise, and the fulfillment of that command is necessary to obtain the promised blessing. In this respect believing is the greatest of all works to be done. This our Lord plainly teaches us, etc., John 6, 28, 29." (p. 287 f.) It is necessary, at times, to insist on the fact that faith is, indeed, "doing something," that it signifies activity. It is also true that the Gospel call is issued in the form of a command (*imperativus evangelicus*), like the quickening word that came to Lazarus in the tomb. But to all intents and purposes the Gospel call is no condition laid down to, and to be fulfilled by, the sinner, in the sense in which we commonly use the terms "condition" and "fulfillment." The author himself insists that "faith is itself a gift of God bestowed through the Gospel," "the acceptance of the gift is wholly by the power of the Gospel." (p. 288.) What interest, then, can the author have in insisting that believing the Gospel is fulfilling a condition?

2. *LIFE'S MORNING*. Addresses to Young Men and Young Women. By Rev. L. H. Schuh, Ph.D. 207 pages; 75 cts.

Five Addresses are offered in this book: Youth Preparatory to Maturity; The Successful Life; The Noblest Calling (the ministry); Christian Growth; A Vocation. They are cheerful in tone, yet of a serious purpose.

3. *NARRATIVES ON THE CATECHISM*. Issued by the Publication Board of the Joint Synod of Ohio. Vol. I: The Ten Commandments; Vol. II: The Creed; Vol. III: The Lord's Prayer; Vol. IV: The Sacraments and Table of Duties.

The well-known works of Caspari, Herman Fick, and Glaser have furnished the contents for this useful volume, which may help to relieve the tedium of the study of the Catechism.

VERFASSUNGSFORMEN DER LUTHERISCHEN KIRCHE AMERIKAS. Von Prof. Chr. Otto Kraushaar. Guetersloh. 1911. 496 pages. Unbound, M. 10; bound, M. 12.

The book falls into four principal divisions: Congregation, Ministerial Office, Synod, and Federations of Synods. Under these heads are codified, in the form of pertinent excerpts, the rules, laws, and agreements which have been adopted in, or by, about sixty Lutheran Synods in our country. The excerpts which exhibit the constitutional status of each of the four subjects aforementioned are taken from standard sources. The author is fully acquainted with the historical material available at present, either in general histories of the entire Lutheran Church in America or in accounts of the genesis and development of particular Lutheran bodies. He has also noted epochal productions of prominent teachers in the American Lutheran Church, and of its controversial and periodical literature. Patient research and painstaking sifting and sorting of material are in evidence throughout this book. As a collection of facts bearing on the constitutional differences between the various organized societies of Lutherans in America this book so far occupies a solitary place, and will be valuable as a book of reference. We have not been in a position to verify the author's excerpts from the originals cited, nor

can we say whether all pertinent statements made by particular bodies on a given subject have been produced. The book makes the impression, however, of an exhaustive treatise within the limits which the author had fixed for himself. The Scandinavian Synods, likewise the Finnish and Slovak bodies, have been omitted from the author's review and account, because their depositions are in a foreign tongue. As regards the Scandinavian bodies, this omission is the more regrettable because the European mother churches of these bodies adopt the episcopate, and it would have been of more than ordinary interest to follow their development under the congregational system prevailing throughout the American Lutheran Church. We hope that in a new edition the author's work will be brought to greater completeness, and greater serviceableness as a book of reference, by an account of these bodies.

The Missouri Synod is represented in this book, in the first division, by excerpts from Walther's *Kirche und Amt* and *Rechte Gestalt*, the original constitutions of the congregations at Frankenthum and Frankentrost (presumably furnished by Loehe and superseded by another which was adopted, after these congregations united with the Missouri Synod), and the constitution of Trinity Congregation at St. Louis, which became typical in the Missouri Synod, and was, at a later period, issued in its essential features in English. — Incidentally we note that on p. 115 the author expresses himself with ominous reserve on the immorality of Stephan, and plainly questions the justice of the proceedings instituted against the man by his followers in Perry County. The fact that Stephan died without having acknowledged his guilt need cause no one any alarm. As to the character of the proceedings against him, the historian will have to suspend his judgment until an authentic account of them is published. In view of the advice of Dr. Lane given before the deposition of Stephan occurred (see Vehse, *Stephansche Auswanderung*, p. 17), we would be inclined to view the secular part of the proceedings against Stephan as an act of mercy. By what court decision Stephan recovered a part of his property, as the author states, we are unable to understand. Stephan's suit for \$3,000.00 indemnity was thrown out of the court. (*Ibid.*, p. 23.) — In the second, third, and fourth division of Prof. Kraushaar's book the Missouri Synod is represented chiefly by its Constitution of 1847, with the later amendments.

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. Edited by James Hastings, M. A., D. D. With the assistance of John A. Selbie, M. A., D. D., and other scholars. Vol. III: Burial—Confessions. XVI and 901 pages. — Vol. IV: Confirmation—Drama. XVI and 907 pages. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1911 and 1912.

We have exhibited to our readers in vol. XIV, pp. 190—192, the general character of this great work, which represents a new effort in encyclopedic literature along partly untrodden paths. As in the two preceding volumes, the contributors are chiefly British scholars, 170 of them being represented in vols. 3 and 4. German scholarship, for reasons easy to guess, is poorly represented in this monumental

work; still, the volumes before us contain contributions from 28 German scholars. France has furnished 11, Holland 4 contributors, Russia, Italy, India, and Japan 2 each, Belgium, Hungary, Finland, and Sweden 1 each. American scholarship is well favored in these volumes, there being 43 American contributors, among whom we note the late Dr. Spaeth of Mount Airy, Dr. Horn of Trinity, Reading, and Prof. Youngert of Augustana College. Drs. Spaeth and Horn have contributed the article "Catechism," and Prof. Youngert writes on "Teutonic Cosmogony and Cosmology." An effort seems to have been made to bring forward the talent of our leading American schools. Johns Hopkins is represented among the contributors by Profs. Bloomfield ("Cerberus"), Robinson ("Greek Drama"), and Smith ("Roman Drama"); Princeton by Prof. Hibben ("Chance"); Yale by Profs. MacCurdy ("Chiriqui"), and Walker ("Congregationalism"); Harvard by Prof. Robinson ("Deae Matres"); Union Theological Seminary by Profs. Brown ("Covenant Theology"), Coe ("Childhood"), Hall ("Coercion"); Western Theology Seminary by Prof. Schaff ("Concubinage, Christian," "Councils and Synods, Medieval, Christian," and "Discipline, Christian"); Hartford Theological Seminary by Profs. Geer ("Cosmogony and Cosmology, Medieval and Modern Christian"), Mitchell ("Cosmogony and Cosmology, Early Christian," and "Death and Disposal of the Dead, Early Christian"), Paton ("Canaanites" and "Dagon"), and Worrell ("Charms and Amulets, Abyssinian"); Newton Theological Institute by Prof. Cross ("Celibacy, Christian"); St. Bernard's Seminary by Prof. Ryan ("Coleridge"). Other leading American schools which are represented in the list of contributors are Columbia U. by Profs. Hyslop ("Change," "Conscience," and "Deontology"), Jackson ("Demons and Spirits, Persian"); Bryn Mawr by Profs. Barton ("Circumcision, Semitic," "Communion with Deity, Hebrew," and "Corners, Demons, and Spirits, Hebrew") and Irons ("Disgust"); Clark U. by Prof. Chamberlain ("Children, American," and "Disease and Medicine, American"); Rutgers by Prof. Marvin ("Consequence"); Haverford by Prof. Jones ("Deliberation"); the American School of Classical Studies at Rome by Dir. Carter ("Chastity, Roman"); and the Catholic U. of America by Prof. Bolling ("Charms and Amulets, Vedic," "Disease and Medicine, Vedic," and "Divination, Vedic"). Our state universities have furnished the following contributors and contributions: Nebraska U.: Prof. Alexander ("Communion with Deity, American"); California U.: Prof. Kroeber ("California"); New York U.: Prof. Shaw ("Culture" and "Desire"); Wisconsin U.: Prof. Showerman ("Criobolium," "Cybele," and "Death and Disposal of the Dead, Roman"); Iowa U.: Prof. Starbuck ("Climate," "Doublemindedness" and "Doubt"); Michigan U.: Prof. Wenley ("Casuistry," "Conscientiousness," and "Cynics"); Minnesota U. by Prof. Wilde ("Doubt"); Chicago U. by Prof. Willett ("Disciples of Christ"). If any system has been followed in the selection of contributors and in the assignment of topics, it does not always appear.

The work aims at exhaustive treatment of every subject undertaken. There is a wealth of information accumulated in this encyclopedia that cannot be duplicated. As a source of information it will be invaluable, and we can appreciate the regret of Prof. P. Lob-

stein of Strassburg (*Literaturzeitung* 37, p. 290) who thinks that the older men now living will not witness the completion of this work.

We should perhaps reiterate what we remarked in a former review, viz., that this work is not a theological encyclopedia. Even the relation to religion and ethics is not always apparent in the subjects chosen for treatment. Wherever strictly theological subjects are treated, one finds views set forth that one would heartily endorse, as well as others from which one must just as heartily dissent. To illustrate, Dr. Lambert, in his article "Call, Calling," writes correctly: "In the N. T. and in Christian theology 'call' and 'calling' are technical terms to denote God's efficacious summons to individuals to partake of the redemptive blessings to which they have been appointed in His eternal purpose (Rom. 8, 28). The Divine call is the act in which the Divine election is revealed and realized. Those whom God calls to salvation He has previously elected; those whom He elects He proceeds to call." But the peculiar use of *κλητοί* in Matt. 22, 14; 20, 16, is not correctly explained by stating: "This saying of Jesus justifies the distinction familiar in the old theology between the *vocatio externa* and the *vocatio interna* — the outward and the effectual call." This distinction is Calvinistic, as the author himself states on the next page: "In the Reformed theology as represented by Calvin, the call is that in which the Divine election is first realized (*Instit.* III. XXIV, 10). A distinction is drawn, however, between two different kinds of call. There is an external call made through the preaching of the Word, not in the impossible sense that it is absolutely world-wide, but as being addressed without distinction to every one who hears it. There is, further, a special or internal call, whereby, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, the Word preached is implanted in the heart as a seed of life (ib. 8). For Calvin the call is effectual, not, as for the Lutheran theologians, because the Word carries within it an inherent converting potentiality, but because, through the power of the Holy Spirit working *ab extra*, it actually effects conversion." This "power working *ab extra*" we know otherwise as irresistible grace, — one of the fatal differences between Lutheran and Reformed teaching. — Special value attaches to the article of Curtis on "Confessions," with the accompanying tables.

MARTIN LUTHER. The Man and His Work. By *Arthur Cushman McGiffert*. New York: The Century Co. 1911. XI and 397 pages.

This is an appreciative, yet critical, Life of "the one real prophet of the Reformation" (p. 383), in 26 chapters, illustrated by 60 most excellent reproductions of personages and localities made famous by events in the life of "the founder of the Protestant Church" (p. 21). Since the illustrations are the first thing that attracts the eye of the purchaser of this book, we wish to speak of them first. We have here 15 full-page portraits by Lucas Cranach, 2 each by Hans Holbein, Raphael, and Titian, one each by Christopher Amberger, Hans Burk-mair, Albrecht Duerer, Clouet, Hans Asper, and Pinturicchio. Nine portraits are by unknown authors, mostly taken from old prints. Twenty-three views of places where Luther lived or performed his

work are either taken from old engravings, or have been recently photographed. These illustrations, together with the clear print and the artistic binding, not only give the book a peculiar charm, but enliven interest in the stirring contents of its pages.

The author writes a nervous style, and has inculcably enhanced the value of what he himself says about Luther by copious extracts from Luther's writings, which are done into good English, with consummate skill. There is not a chapter, hardly a page, where there are not flashes from Luther's mind. Not infrequently Luther speaks to us through several pages in succession.—The chapters follow a chronological order; however, cognate matters are often discussed out of their time-sequence, in topical fashion. This gives to some of the chapters the comprehensive character of an essay.

What is the quality of the author's judgment? He has strikingly portrayed the character of Luther's chief foe, the papacy, with its absolutism. The blame for that titanic struggle which began with the publication of Luther's Theses is placed entirely on the would-be sovereign of the world in secular and spiritual affairs, the Roman Curia. Luther's oft-criticised vehemence of speech in his antipapal polemics draws a note of genuine approval from the author, thus: "He was better acquainted than most men with the common people of his day, and he knew strong language was needed to move and arouse them. He was working not to win a reputation, but to stir up a nation, and while many others were appealing to a small and select circle of the cultured, vast multitudes were hanging on his words. His fiercest onslaughts carried terror and joy to the ends of Christendom, and by them no less than by his inimitable appeals to the finer sentiments he swayed and dominated the masses. Often he went beyond all reason and broke the canons of good taste recognized even in that free-spoken age; but he was not engaged in a parlor exhibition, and he would have cared as little for our criticism of his style of fighting as he did for the criticisms of his contemporaries. Had he been other than he was, he might have been better liked by many a delicate soul, but he could not have wielded the influence he did. He needs no apologies from us. As well apologize for the fury of the wind as for the vehemence of Martin Luther." (p. 155.)—Also the religious motive in Luther has been shown to be the one propelling force in all he did. And this motive, too, draws from the author words of admiration. Yet in the successive account of Luther's break with radicalism (the Zwickau prophets and the Peasants), and with Humanism (Erasmus; pp. 228—272) there is an undercurrent of sadness, as if in this lopping off of heterogeneous and dangerous elements there is something to be deplored. Also the outcome of the Leipsic debate is wrongly given: "Eck repeatedly protested that he held all his opinions subject to correction by the ecclesiastical authorities, but Luther avowed submission to no one. Only to the clear teaching of the divine Word would he bow, and he would read it with his own and not with another man's eyes. In his attack on indulgences he had appealed from the indulgence-venders to the pope; at Augsburg, from the pope-ill-informed to the pope-to-be-better-informed; and soon afterward from the pope to a council. Now, when the decision of a council was cited against him, he declined

to be bound by it, and took his stand upon the sole authority of the Scriptures. *But even this was not final.* [Italics ours.] The Bible itself, he maintained, has to be used with discrimination, for parts of it do not teach Christian truth. He really substituted for all external authorities the enlightened conscience of the individual Christian." What seems a shifting of base on the part of Luther is fully explained by the frequent turns which his controversy with Rome took. Besides, through the admission of the apocrypha and deuterocanonical books into the Bible, Luther was indeed forced to settle the question, What constitutes the Bible? But Luther knew of no authority in divine matters outside of the inspired Word of God. He recognized no conscience as enlightened except as by the Word. — Also Luther's conduct towards the Peasants and at Marburg is placed under undue stricture, the author offering the materials for his own refutation in what he cites from Luther in these very chapters. — The theologian will miss in this book an entering into the finer points of doctrine in the many controversies of Luther. Still, the book is a remarkable product of our age, and, together with the book of Dr. Preserved Smith, previously noted, shows the unabated interest of men in Luther, the man, and in his work. As long as men still study Luther, even though they misunderstand him in one detail or other, the bulwark reared against Rome's absolutism four hundred years ago remains. For this reason we are thankful that this book was written, even though it excels chiefly in the delineation of the humanness of the Reformer.

PREPARING TO PREACH. By *David R. Breed*, D.D. Professor of Homiletics in Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburg, Pa. New York: Geo. H. Doran Co. 455 pages.

Next to Arthur Hoyt's "Work of Preaching," this work is the best contribution to the literature on homiletics that has appeared in the last five years, and in a number of respects, especially in the critical use that has been made of the abundance of cognate treatises, and in the detailed presentation of various forms of sermons, it surpasses Hoyt. After an introduction explaining "The Essential Element" in preaching, which is "bearing a message from the Most High God," "speaking with authority," the author ingeniously divides his treatise into these main parts: I. The Study; II. The Pulpit; III. Various Kinds of Sermons. The insistence on a text, on the preacher's duty by his text, and on textual analysis, we consider one of the strongest parts in the book, and a most hopeful sign of the times. One cannot always agree with the views advanced by the author, but his advice is, upon the whole, so practical, his reasoning so lucid, and there is so much cordiality in his entire treatment of his subject (comp., e. g., the chapter on "Ministerial Senility") that the reader is carried through this bulky volume with unabated interest, and puts the book aside with the consciousness of having read a useful book.

The Gospel Trumpet Co., of Anderson, Ind., sends us: A RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY, by Chas. E. Orr; RAYS OF HOPE, by D. O. Teasley; THE GRACE OF HEALING, by J. W. Byers.

Stub for

#4 vol. 16

•

1

